

E
B
R
U
A
R
Y
1936

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SOVIET POLICY AND THE
ENACE OF WAR
BY MOLOTOV

THE WEBBS' BOOK ON THE
SOVIET UNION REVIEWED
BY PALME DUTT

WITTO BAUER, WHAT COURSE
ARE YOU STEERING?
BY VIDEN

INTERVIEW WITH DIMITROFF
ANSWER TO RIBBENTROP

NUMBER 2
PRICE 15 CENTS



What Is Communism?

By EARL BROWDER

This lively book, just off the press, represents the best popular explanation of Communism yet printed. Mere mention of some of the chapter headings—"Fascism: American Brand", "Force and Violence", "The Question of Tactics", "What About Religion", "The Farmer-Labor Party", gives some idea of the broad range of the contents. Comrade Browder's brilliant radio broadcast of March 5, which reached millions of listeners, only touched on a few of the many subjects elaborated in this book.

254 pages—50 cents

Clothbound—\$2.00

FIVE NEW PAMPHLETS

THE TOWNSEND PLAN—WHAT IT IS AND
WHAT IT ISN'T, By *Alex Bittelman* 5c

A LABOR PARTY FOR THE UNITED STATES.
Speeches by Francis J. Gorman and Isidore Nagler
at the 55th Convention of the A. F. of L.; the
resolution on the Labor Party, introduced into
the Convention by Gorman; and other materials 5c

MISS U.S.S.R.—The Story of a Girl Stakhanovite . 5c

LINCOLN AND THE COMMUNISTS, By *Earl Brow-
der*. Containing choice quotations from Lincoln,
Marx and Lenin 5c

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published monthly in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese and Spanish

Vol. XIII

FEBRUARY, 1936

No. 2

CONTENTS

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION, THE GROWING WAR MENACE AND THE SOVIET POLICY	239
<i>By V. MOLOTOV</i>	
THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF GERMAN FASCISM—REPLY TO HERR RIBBENTROP	248
<i>By G. DIMITROFF</i>	
THE SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY OF THE GLORIOUS PROLETARIAN FIGHTER—WILHELM PIECK	253
THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT IS COLLECTING ITS FORCES	261
FOR THE CORRECT CARRYING OUT OF THE LINE OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS	268
<i>By K. GOTTLAWD</i>	
THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE	289
<i>By MAURICE THOREZ</i>	
SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE EXPERIENCES OF THE CANADIAN COM- MUNISTS	300
<i>By JOHN PORTER</i>	
WHAT COURSE ARE YOU STEERING, OTTO BAUER?	310
<i>By PETER VIDEN</i>	
SOUKUP AND STIVIN, STRIKE-BREAKERS OF THE UNITED FRONT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT	320
<i>By V. K.</i>	
RUDOLPH CLAUS	326
THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT AND OUR ENEMIES	331
<i>By A. RUBINES</i>	
IN MEMORIAM—COMRADE SHAPURIJI SAKLATVALA	347
<i>By HARRY POLLITT</i>	

REVIEWS

THE STAKHANOV MOVEMENT AS DEALT WITH BY THE COM- MUNIST PRESS	351
<i>By ROTOR</i>	
THE WEBBS' BOOK ON THE SOVIET UNION	361
<i>By R. PALME DUTT</i>	

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, \$1.75; six months, \$.90; single copies, 15 cents.

HITLER AGAINST THE WORLD THE WORLD AGAINST HITLER

A powerful exposé, in the light of the Nazi Nuremberg Congress, of the war plans of Europe's mad dog who has already set in motion his armies of destruction by invading the Rhineland zone. This stirring pamphlet presents a detailed picture of conditions in Hitler-Germany, of the decay and seething discontent of the masses against the regime of hunger and terror.

48 pages—5 cents

THE MENACE OF A NEW WORLD WAR

A symposium of opinion on the danger of war, based on a Marxist-Leninist analysis by the foremost leaders of the Communist International. Quotations from Dimitroff, Ercoli, Manuilsky, Cachin, Thorez, Marty, Kuusinen, Wang Ming, Gottwald and others. The chapter, "What Must Be Done", summarizes the tasks of the working class, led by its revolutionary Communist Party, in the struggle for peace.

48 pages—5 cents

IN THE DUNGEONS OF MUSSOLINI

By CARLO ROSSI

A vivid description of actual experience in the horrible dungeons of Mussolini, the terrible tortures inflicted on political prisoners by the bloody Special Tribunal set up by the fascist regime. Aladino Bibòlotti, who sends a special message to Americans in this pamphlet, is a leader of the Italian Communist Party who served eight years in the fascist prisons, and is fully qualified by personal experience to speak of the atrocities perpetuated under Mussolini.

32 pages—5 cents

Order from your nearest bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

The International Situation, the Growing War Menace and the Soviet Policy*

By V. MOLOTOV

DURING the past year the relations between the Soviet Union and other countries have on the whole developed normally. In the majority of cases our relations with foreign states developed in a direction favorable to the cause of peace. At any rate, the Soviet government did everything in its power to strengthen the cause of universal peace and, primarily, to strengthen peace in Europe and Asia. (*Applause.*)

There is no need just now to dwell in detail on the relations between the U.S.S.R. and individual countries. As compared with the period in which the Seventh Congress of Soviets met, no essential changes have taken place, and on certain important points I shall have occasion to dwell later.

As an example illustrating the idea behind the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, one might point to our relations with our immediate neighbors, the states on our borders.

Along the whole of our vast land frontiers in the West, South and East, a total length of about 20,000 kilometers, there are situated fairly large, middle-sized and small states which are not always as friendly towards the U.S.S.R. as, let us say, Turkey. (*Loud applause.*) Throughout all this period not a single one of these states has had any cause for anxiety as far as we are concerned. On the contrary, even the smallest states, including those whose policy is frequently dependent on the pressure of the anti-Soviet forces of larger imperialist powers, have never had, nor have now, any reason to express anxiety with regard to the Soviet Union. However, I must deal separately with our relations on the Far Eastern frontiers, where, in connection with the occupation of Manchuria by Japan, a specific situation, as you know, has been created.

With a view to ensuring peace in Europe, the Soviet government, and also the governments of France, Czechoslovakia and certain other states, attached great importance to the conclusion of what is known as the East-European Mutual Assistance Pact, which, on the proposal of France, was to be signed, besides the U.S.S.R., by France and Czechoslovakia, and also by Germany, Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. However, owing to the counteraction of Germany and then of Poland, the East-European Mutual Assistance Pact fell through.

This did not prevent the conclusion last May of a treaty of mutual assistance between France and the Soviet Union. During the visit paid to Moscow by M. Laval, the present Prime Minister of France, there was re-affirmed the common desire of the U.S.S.R. and France to facilitate the conclusion of a regional East-European pact between the

* From the report to the January 1936 Session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R.

states already mentioned, imposing the obligations of non-aggression, consultation and non-assistance to an aggressor.

Following on this a treaty of mutual assistance was signed between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia. In doing so the representatives of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia declared that they regarded both the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and France and the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia merely as a partial attainment of the aim of ensuring peace in Eastern Europe.

In the communique issued in regard to the conversations which took place in Moscow with M. Benes, now President of Czechoslovakia, it was stated that the representatives of both countries at the present time attach exceptional importance "to the actual realization of an all-inclusive collective organization of security on the basis of the indivisibility of peace". This is the policy to which the government of the Soviet Union has adhered and still adheres.

I shall also mention the visit paid to Moscow by Mr. Eden, now the British Foreign Secretary. The importance of this visit will be gathered from the fact that as a result of the conversations between the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and Mr. Eden it was possible to announce that "at the present time there is no conflict of interests between the two governments on any important question of international policy". The conditions therefore favor a further development of Anglo-Soviet relations.

Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the whole developed normally, chiefly in the commercial and economic field. In this connection one cannot ignore the repeated attempts, fostered by circles which are definitely reactionary and inclined towards fascism, artificially to fan an anti-Soviet campaign in a certain section of the American press, with the object of undermining the policy of closer relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. which is of tremendous importance to the preservation of universal peace.

During the past year diplomatic relations were established by the U.S.S.R. with Belgium, Luxemburg and Colombia.

On the other hand, the government of Uruguay, under the pressure of Brazilian and, it is said, also of certain European reactionaries, has broken off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

If the Uruguayan gentlemen are to be believed, one might think that the Soviet government has nothing else to concern itself with but the internal affairs of Brazil and Uruguay (*laughter and applause*), which those gentlemen, the Brazilian and Uruguayan rulers, evidently understand very badly if they attribute all their misfortunes to others. If you have read Demyan Byedny's New Year poem, *A Political Dodberry*, which gives a fairly adequate explanation of the Uruguayan incident (*general laughter and applause*) and its connection with the question of Uruguayan cheese and so on, there is no need to dwell on the Uruguayan gentlemen any longer. (*Laughter and applause.*)

However, the Soviet government cannot ignore acts, even on the part of Uruguay, which are not only absolutely unjustified in regard to our country but are also a direct violation of the covenant of the League of

Nations, to which both the U.S.S.R. and Uruguay belong. The People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs has therefore lodged a protest with the League of Nations against the action of the Uruguayan government (*laughter*) as expressed in the rupture of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. without first submitting the dispute to a court of arbitration or to the Council of the League, as the covenant of the League of Nations requires. (*Applause.*)

I shall now pass to the relations with Germany and Japan, which, for obvious reasons, attract the particular attention of the toilers of our country.

I shall begin with Germany.

I must say quite frankly that the Soviet government would welcome the establishment of better relations with Germany than exist at present. This seems to us unquestionably expedient from the standpoint of the interests of the peoples both of the U.S.S.R. and of Germany. But the realization of such a policy depends not only on us but also on the German government.

And what is the foreign policy of the present German government? I spoke of the principal trend of this foreign policy at the Seventh Congress of Soviets, when I quoted from Herr Hitler's book *My Struggle*, which is in a sense a program, and which is being distributed in Germany in millions of copies. In this book Herr Hitler definitely speaks of the necessity of adopting "*a policy of territorial conquest*". And in this connection, Herr Hitler explicitly declares: "*When we speak of new lands in Europe today we can only think in the first instance of Russia and her border states.*"

Since the time these statements of Herr Hitler's were read from the rostrum of the Congress of Soviets, the German government has made no attempt to renounce these plans of aggrandizement at the expense of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, by its silence it has fully confirmed that Herr Hitler's statements referred to still retain their validity. For us, this was not unexpected. Carrying their plans to extremes, the National-Socialists, as we all know, are driving their preparations precisely in the direction of such aggrandizement, although not in this direction alone.

This criminal propaganda of the seizure of foreign territory has now found new followers outside of Germany. All sort of understudies of German capital are to be found in neighboring Poland, such as M. Studnitski and the other hare-brained gentlemen on the Cracow newspaper *Chas*, who have gone to such lengths as to blab openly in the press of the seizure of certain territories belonging to the U.S.S.R., of which certain dotards have frequently dreamed in their drunken ravings. (*Laughter and applause.*) Such hallucinations are not unknown to certain elements in neighboring Finland who are orientating themselves more and more on the most aggressive imperialist states.

Everybody knows that German fascism is not merely confining itself to elaborating plans of conquest, but is preparing to act in the immediate future. The German fascists have in the sight of all turned the country which has fallen into their hands into a military camp, which, owing

to its position in the very center of Europe, constitutes a menace not only to the Soviet Union. Even if we do not mention other countries, who does not know that over Czechoslovakia, for instance, which is not threatening any of her neighbors and is engaged in peaceful toil, have gathered the dark clouds of German fascism, bristling with soldiers' bayonets and gun muzzles, supplied with every known and but yesterday still unknown chemical for poisoning and infecting people, armed with swift and silent war-planes for the purpose of unexpected attack, and equipped with everything which converts modern warfare into a mass slaughter not only of soldiers at the front but also of simple, peaceful citizens, of women and children?

All this constitutes a growing menace to the peace of Europe, and not of Europe alone.

How contradictory is the situation in present-day Germany can be seen from the following.

Side by side with the desperate anti Soviet foreign policy of definite ruling circles in Germany, at the initiative of the German government, an agreement between Germany and the U.S.S.R. was proposed and concluded on April 9, 1935, for a credit of 200,000,000 marks for a period of five years. On the whole, this credit is being successfully utilized by us, just as is the five-year credit of 250,000,000 kroner extended to us last year by Czechoslovakia. In recent months representatives of the German government have offered us a new and larger credit, this time for a period of ten years. Although we are not running after foreign credits and, unlike in the past, are now to a large extent making our purchases abroad for cash and not on credit, we have not refused, nor are we now refusing, to consider also this business proposal of the German government.

The development of commercial and economic relations with other states, irrespective of the political forces that are temporarily ruling those countries, is in conformity with the policy of the Soviet government. We think that it is also in conformity with the interests of the German people, and it is the business of the government of Germany, of course, to draw its practical conclusions.

Finally, as regards relations with Japan.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated its peaceable and accommodating spirit by concluding an agreement for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway in Manchuria. The agreement for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway was signed last March. The railway has been handed over to the Japanese-Manchurian authorities. The payments to the Soviet Union of the sums due for the Chinese Eastern Railway and the purchase of goods with these sums in Japan and Manchuria are proceeding normally. On all other practical questions the Soviet Union has also hitherto found ways of reaching agreements with Japan.

However, the principal question in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and Japan remains unsettled. Japan so far has evaded the proposal we made three years ago for the conclusion of a Soviet-Japanese treaty of non-aggression. Such conduct cannot be regarded otherwise than as suspicious.

On the other hand, there is no cessation or reduction in the number of attempts made by Japanese-Manchurian troops to violate our frontiers. I will mention one incident that took place on October 12 in the Novo-Alexeyevka district, when about 50 Japanese and Manchurian soldiers crossed the frontier line and penetrated more than two kilometers into Soviet territory, opening rifle and machine-gun fire on our frontier troops. As a result of the exchange of shots, Kotelnikov, commander of the frontier unit, was killed and two other frontier men were wounded. Meeting with an energetic repulse and having suffered corresponding losses, the frontier violators withdrew to Manchurian territory. But the provocative nature of such incidents is obvious without further explanation.

Here is another example of the conduct of representatives of the Japanese government, conduct which is also incompatible with normal relations.

Nearly six months have already elapsed since our ambassador to Japan, Comrade Yurenev, submitted a draft agreement for the creation of Soviet-Japanese-Manchurian frontier committees for the examination and liquidation of frontier incidents. But so far the Japanese government has not replied to our proposal.

It is said that the frontier incidents on the Soviet borders were required by certain Japanese military circles in order to divert attention from the way they are lording it in Manchuria and from their expansionist activities in North China and on the territory of the Chinese Republic generally. It is asserted that these and similar frontier incidents were required by certain persons in Japan in order to demonstrate to the foreign world the "firmness" and "strength" of Japanese policy. One thing is clear, that this playing with fire along our Far Eastern frontiers is not ceasing, and that the Japanese militarists are drawing nearer to our frontiers both directly and through the territory of others.

A report recently appeared of the conclusion of a military agreement between Japan and Germany and of Poland's connection with this matter. There is nothing unexpected in this for us. It is not for nothing that both Japan and Germany left the League of Nations in good time, in order to leave their hands free, and, with good reason, are regarded by the whole world as the powers with the most aggressive foreign policy.

The fascist rulers of Germany sometimes endeavor to divert the attention of naive people from their plans of conquest with regard to the Soviet Union by referring to the absence of common frontiers between Germany and the U.S.S.R. But we know, on the other hand, that Germany, encouraged by certain foreign powers, is feverishly preparing to secure a dominant position in the Baltic and has established special relations with Poland, which has fairly extensive common frontiers with the Soviet Union.

Therefore in respect both to our Eastern and our Western frontiers, we must place our defense on a proper footing. (*Applause.*)

Not a little has been done in this direction during the past few years.

But when it is a question of protecting the peaceful labor of the workers and collective farmers of our country from foreign attack, when it is a question of defending our gains and the great work of socialist construction, we cannot rest content with the results achieved in the matter of defense. (*Applause.*)

We must find all the necessary material resources for this, without stint, and therefore we must this year considerably increase that part of our state budget which is connected with the defense of the country. (*Applause.* Comrade Stalin moves closer to the presidium table and is greeted by prolonged applause. All rise. Cheers.) We have trained a powerful workers' and peasants' Red Army (*applause*) and we must now work still more persistently and see to it that our entire army consists of devoted fighters who have completely mastered their job—airmen, artillery men, chemical fighters, tank operators, sharpshooters and fighters of all other necessary arms. (*Applause.*) We have introduced personal titles for the commanding ranks of the Red Army in order still further to strengthen and enhance the importance of the leading cadres of our army. (*Applause.*) Only such a Red Army can effectively serve the cause of peace, the cause of the defense of the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the cause of socialism. (*Applause.*)

We must continue to strengthen our Red Army and at the same time utilize every opportunity for upholding peace and for explaining to the toilers of all countries the special line of principle we are pursuing in the international policy of peace.

The fact that we have joined the League of Nations does not mean that there is no longer a radical difference in principle between Soviet foreign policy and the policy of the foreign powers. The experience with the Italo-Ethiopian war has shown that the contrary is the case.

The Italo-Ethiopian war is a typical imperialist war for colonies. Italian fascism is openly advocating the policy of seizing Ethiopia and transforming her into an Italian colony. Regarding herself as a slighted power in the matter of the colonial spoils which the principal imperialist states divided up among themselves after the World War, Italy has launched a new war in order to extend her colonial possessions by force of arms at the expense of Ethiopia. Fascist Italy in this case is acting as the initiator of a new partial re-division of the world, which is pregnant with great consequences and many unexpected surprises for the ruling capitalist classes in Europe. The fascist government is demanding that the other imperialists and the League of Nations as a whole should support its colonial offensive.

The true policy of the powers is revealed in their attitude towards the Italo-Ethiopian war. It is the major decisive powers that must be chiefly borne in mind here.

At a superficial glance it may appear that there are differences of principle between these powers with regard to the policy of colonial conquest. Actually, of course, this is not so. The difference in the positions of the various capitalist states belonging to the League of Nations by no means consists in a difference in principle with regard to colonial conquest. This difference is to be explained primarily by

the fact that the various major powers are differently interested in the degree to which Italy's imperialist might should be strengthened. This may also be said of the powers which do not belong to the League of Nations. There is not a single capitalist power which would place the independence of any weak country above the interests of its own selfish participation in the division of colonies.

The Soviet Union alone has taken up a definite position of principle with regard to the Italo-Ethiopian war, a position hostile to imperialism, a position hostile to a policy of colonial conquest of any kind. The Soviet Union alone has declared that it bases itself on the principle of the equality and independence of Ethiopia which, in addition, is a member of the League of Nations, and that it cannot support any action of the League of Nations or of individual capitalist states which aims at violating this independence and equality. This policy of the Soviet Union, which distinguishes it in principle from the other members of the League of Nations, is one of exceptional international significance and one which will yet yield valuable fruit.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated in the League of Nations its fidelity to this principle—the principle of the political independence and national equality of all states—in the case of one of the small countries, Ethiopia. The Soviet Union has also taken advantage of its membership of the League of Nations to put into practice its policy towards an imperialist aggressor.

The first year of the Soviet Union's membership of the League of Nations has fully borne out the correctness of our decision to join the League. Despite all the shortcomings natural to the League of Nations as an organization of capitalist states, the League has to a certain degree served as a restraining force on war mongers and aggressors. The League of Nations can and should be criticized for not having taken adequate measures, for instance, in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian war, in respect to which the League of Nations after all was obliged to express its opinion as to who was the aggressor. It must also be admitted that the League did nothing to prevent this war. However, the fact cannot be ignored that in the present case the League of Nations hampered not those who served the cause of peace, but those who wanted to help the aggressor. It is in this light that we must consider the participation of the U.S.S.R. in the decisions of the League in the matter of the Italo-Ethiopian war and, in particular, in the economic sanctions against Italy, which was adjudged by the League as the aggressor.

The Italo-Ethiopian war shows that the threat of a world war is growing and is steadily spreading over Europe.

This war has only just begun and it is impossible at present to say when and how it will end. Who, however, does not see that Italian fascism is playing with big stakes?

The fact that the dominant forces in Italy regard as the principal way of strengthening their position, not internal economic and cultural progress, but a risky war for new colonies, speaks for itself. Even now, when the capitalist countries are more or less—and, it should be said, very unevenly—emerging from the economic crisis of the past few

years, they themselves no longer believe in the possibility of achieving any considerable increase of strength by the development of their internal forces. It is only in this way that one can understand the launching of new imperialist wars for colonies. And this, too, is the underlying reason for the Italo-Ethiopian war.

Countries like Japan and Germany, and now Italy, have already advanced, or are prepared any day to advance, to the foreground in new conflicts between the imperialist powers of the whole world. There is not a single capitalist state which is not in one way or another affected by the activity of the foreign policy of the three mentioned powers. In this international situation the responsibility of the Soviet Union is particularly great.

Whoever launches into a new imperialist war may succeed in breaking his neck before accomplishing his plans of aggrandizement. (*Applause.*) The possibility is not excluded that the calculations of the imperialist cliques on the passivity of the masses of the people may be upset at the most unexpected moment, as has been the case before. (*Applause.*) It is not difficult for us, Bolsheviks, to understand such strivings on the part of the masses of the people. We also know that the masses of the people in capitalist countries have no sympathy for the predatory plans of the imperialists of all shades, especially of the imperialists in the fascist camp.

But we, the toilers of the Soviet Union, must rely for the defense of our cause on our own strength, and on the defense of our fatherland —first and foremost on our Red Army. (*Applause.*) We shall take every measure to frustrate every possibility of an external attack on our country by the imperialists. But if they attack us notwithstanding, we have no doubt that our Red Army will inflict the repulse they deserve. (*Applause.*)

The working class of Russia, together with the revolutionary peasantry, has flung off the yoke of the landlords and capitalists and has helped to bring about the national emancipation of all the peoples of the former Russian empire. The toilers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are now working harmoniously to build a new life and are really advancing towards a happy life.

And yet there are imperialist gentlemen who dream of robbing the peoples of the Soviet Union of their freedom and of saddling us with foreign landlords and capitalists. To this we reply: "Dear sirs, open your eyes, you were born too late!" (*Loud and prolonged applause.*)

There was a time when we suffered the rigors of foreign military intervention, but then we were weak and hungry and had not yet really managed to breathe the fresh air. But even then the imperialist plans to destroy our state collapsed ignominiously.

Since then conditions in our country have radically changed.

The national economy is now not what it was ten and fifteen years ago. Every important branch of industry has been technically reconstructed, and on this basis new people have already grown up who have mastered technique and are advancing the productivity of socialist labor with Stakhanovite speed.

Since that time the most backward part of our country—the village—has been reconstructed to its very foundations. The collective farms and the liquidation of the last of the capitalist classes—the kulaks—have put the finishing touches to the liquidation of classes in our country. With the destruction of the last of the capitalist class strata in the countryside, which like small parasites, were particularly tenacious, the whole revenue of our country now passes into the hands of the toilers and their state. Life has improved, and now as never before the doors to a happy and cultured life for all the peoples of our Union stand wide open. We are already enjoying the first fruits of our victory and we see that an unparalleled rise in the standard of living and culture of all the peoples of the Soviet Union awaits us.

And in spite of all this, we have not yet seen the last of people who in their blind hatred of the new world are planning the seizure and dismemberment of the Soviet Union. Well, what shall we say to them? It is true we appeared in the world without the permission of these gentlemen (*laughter and applause*), and undoubtedly against their wishes. . . . (*Laughter and applause*.)

That means that the time has come when the old world must make way for the new.

(*Loud applause, the chairman's bell only serves to evoke new outbursts of stormy applause. All rise. Cries of: "Long live the Marshal of the Soviet Union, Comrade Voroshilov!" "Long live Comrade Stalin!" followed by loud and prolonged cheers and applause.*)

The Legal System of German Fascism

REPLY TO HERR RIBBENTROP

(Interview of G. Dimitroff with Representatives of the Press.)

[In the fascist newspaper Voelkischer Beobachter of December 18, 1935, Von Ribbentrop, Hitler's "special plenipotentiary" on questions of foreign policy, published a letter to Lord Allen of Hartwood, in reply to the request of certain English lawyers—addressed through Lord Allen personally to Hitler—that Hans Luetten, a German lawyer, be released.

In this letter Ribbentrop puts forward a number of theses. First, that the present regime in Germany constitutes a special legal system which corresponds to the "spirit" and "natural feelings" of the German people. Second, that the advent of the German fascists to power on January 30, 1933, was a "revolution". Third, that the historic mission of German fascism is to save civilization. Fourth and last, that he, Ribbentrop, helped to obtain the release of Dimitroff, a fact which he now bitterly regrets.

Ribbentrop regrets the "magnanimity" of the German government in releasing Dimitroff.

Referring to the report delivered by Comrade Dimitroff at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, which he foully distorts, Herr Ribbentrop writes: "This carefully elaborated program is the result of the release of Dimitroff, i.e., the result of the liberal British outlook and German good nature and magnanimity!"

. Below we publish Comrade Dimitroff's reply to questions put to him by representatives of the press on this subject.—ED.]

QUESTION: What is your opinion of the letter written by the Hitler diplomat Ribbentrop to Lord Allen of Hartwood, published in the official organ of the German government Voelkischer Beobachter on December 18, in answer to the demand for the liberation of the German lawyer Luetten, addressed by English lawyers to Hitler?

DIMITROFF: Herr Ribbentrop is not giving his individual opinion alone. Indeed, his personal opinions are of very little value. His letter can only be regarded as an official statement from the German government attempting to justify the monstrous crimes which have given rise to a wave of protests throughout the civilized world. Ribbentrop writes as the mouthpiece of unbridled German fascism which is attempting to win the support of public opinion in England both for punishing its political opponents and for the war adventures that it is planning. It is not accidental that this letter has appeared at a time when the dastardly execution of the German Communist Claus has aroused the indignation of all honest people throughout the world; at a time when, faced with the catastrophe of starvation into which fascism has driven the toiling

masses of Germany, the German fascists are greatly intensifying the terror throughout the country. In speaking openly in defense of those who wield the executioner's ax, their accomplice in the kid gloves of a diplomat, by his letter, virtually challenges the whole of world public opinion.

QUESTION: *What do you think of Ribbentrop's assertion that the present German regime represents a special legal system corresponding to the "spirit" and "natural feelings of the German people"?*

DIMITROFF: Ribbentrop's statement is a gross insult to the great German people. What cynicism must one possess, and with what "Nietzschean" contempt must one regard the people to whom Ribbentrop's letter is directly addressed to make such a statement. Fascism and a legal system are two things which are absolutely incompatible. Fascism is the negation of any kind of legal system. In essence fascism is arbitrary rule. It is the arbitrary rule of an armed gang of hirelings of big capital who enslave the vast majority of the people in the interests not only of the exploiting minority in general, but precisely in the interests of the most rapacious exploiters.

What kind of legal system is it—apart from its alleged conformity to the "spirit" and "natural feelings" of the German people—that has deprived nine-tenths of this people of elementary political rights? What kind of a legal system is it that is destroying the flower of the German people in prisons and concentration camps? What kind of a legal system is it that, as Ribbentrop himself says, keeps incarcerated people like Luetten, who are absolutely innocent, simply because they have a different "spiritual viewpoint" from that of Herr Ribbentrop?

Ribbentrop's justification for the annulment of the old legal system in Germany is, as he says, that "Adolf Hitler could also be tried under the same clauses" of the criminal code as other mortals. But a system under which no fascist murderer is held responsible for his criminal acts before any court and under any clause of the law, is an arbitrary system. It is a regime of criminals in power.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the "special legal system" of Ribbentrop stands closer to the "system" of the American gangsters who terrorize the population of the U.S.A. than to any other existing legal system. Under what legal system, for example, can we include the provocative burning of the Reichstag by the German fascists? Let the "coordinated" German Academy of Law, whose materials Herr Ribbentrop so obligingly promises to send to Lord Allen, try from the viewpoint of a legal system to justify this provocative act which served, as its initiators planned, as a pretext for a whole number of St. Bartholomew's nights. By no "legal system" will the Ribbentrops be able to justify such a step as the arrest of people who had nothing whatever to do with the affair, and their trial on the charge of setting fire to the Reichstag, when the whole world knows that the Reichstag was set on fire at the orders and under the leadership of the fascist rulers.

Let the German Academy of Law try to give a legal justification of the assassinations so frequently practiced by the fascists, or the numerous cases of murder during so-called "attempts to escape", or

the death sentences passed on anti-fascists on the basis of forged documents and false witnesses. Let it try to justify the system of tortures and inquisition to which the fascist hangmen subject imprisoned Communists, Social-Democrats and other anti-fascists. Let Herr Ribbentrop explain what standards of a legal system embrace such actions as the murder by a fascist of the German Professor Lessing on Czechoslovakian territory, as the bloody slaughter of June 30, as the murder of General Schleicher and his wife, as the shooting of scores of Storm Troopers. And what about the anti-Semitic pogroms and the persecution of Catholics, which recall the worst pages of the times of the inquisition, of the times of the Huguenots? And sterilization? Under what legal system are such vile acts permissible? And the Bacchanalia of the public burning of the immortal production of human thought and genius?

Yes, such a "special legal system" has had precedents in history, in the dark days of the Middle Ages. It still arouses horror among those who study the history of tortures, the stake, the burning of "heretics", the execution of Giordano Bruno, the brutal "racks" upon which unfortunate people were stretched during the days of Ivan the Terrible. At that time also there were executioners striking off heads at the place of execution, at that time also there were Ribbentrops who lauded this "special legal system". But we know that the peoples utterly destroyed this system, and without regret drove out those who were the bearers of it. And it needed the spiritual degeneration of bourgeois society and all the rottenness of decaying capitalism to revive this system once more, and to bring shame on the country which has given the world Marx and Engels, Goethe, Schiller, Wagner and Heine. The court of history will not be gentler with those who have raised the ax and the block as the symbol of modern medievalism in an epoch when the five-pointed star with the emblem of the hammer and sickle is already blazing over one-sixth of the globe.

QUESTION: *What is your estimate of Ribbentrop's statement that "revolutions are not decided in court rooms and in accordance with the ordinary legal standards"?*

DIMITROFF: It is quite true that revolutions are not decided in court rooms and on the basis of the ordinary legal standards. But Herr Ribbentrop, thinking that he has here found the key to the justification of the crimes of German fascism, forgot one "small thing". The whole point is that the advent of the German fascists to power on January 30, 1933, was not a revolution at all. It is well known that every genuine revolution means the passing of power from one class into the hands of another class. But in Germany, the bourgeoisie as a class were in power and have remained in power. The capitalist system has remained untouched. All that has changed is that the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic and most imperialistic circles of finance capital have become the complete masters and have extremely intensified capitalist exploitation and oppression. Political forgery will not help Ribbentrop. He thinks that by sticking the verbal label "National-Socialist revolution" onto the reactionary frenzy of the fascists, he thereby justifies the fascist terror. It never occurs to the fascist diplomat that real revolu-

tions, however harsh they may be, do not need justification, because they lift the people, which bring about the revolution, and the whole of mankind as a consequence, to a higher stage of human civilization. But the reason why the bloody orgy of the fascists cannot be justified in any way is that it reduces the great German people to the level of barbarism.

The fascist legend of a National-Socialist revolution has hitherto been an article primarily for home consumption, intended to lead the masses astray and to take the place of the fats, meat and eggs that are not forthcoming. Ribbentrop, Hitler's traveling salesman, is now attempting to throw these rotten goods onto the European market. He quite seriously recommends the raging fascist frenzy as a "model of revolution" for all other nations.

It is impossible not to smile when reading such a statement by Ribbentrop as that the notorious methods of the National-Socialist revolution "have nothing resembling them in history" and "are in crying contradiction to the cruel and barbarous methods by which revolutions were carried out among other peoples of the cultured world", and that, finally, they serve to "preserve the ethical and moral principles of the people". All this represents such record-making in shameless lying that it does not even need a reply. It is truly fascist "model" of boundless insolence.

QUESTION: What is your attitude to the statement of Ribbentrop that it is the historic mission of German fascism to save civilization?

DIMITROFF: The same as it would be to a statement of American gangsters if they were to attribute to themselves the mission of saving mankind from banditry. It is well known that the German fascists direct their blows against everything which bears the imprint of human progress, free thought, independent creation, against all who are not fascists. It could not be otherwise, because fascism is the most merciless enemy of human progress and civilization. It is the embodiment of the most savage and unbridled obscurantism. It directs its blows first and foremost against the working class movement and particularly against communism, because communism represents the vanguard of the world working class movement, because it is the bearer of a new civilization, because, as the famous French writer, Andre Gide, recently correctly expressed it, communism is "the common cause of the peoples of the whole world".

And this role of communism stands out with particular clearness in the light of those great achievements of socialist construction which have been brought about in the U.S.S.R. under the wise direction of the greatest man of our era, Stalin. Millions of people—workers, peasants, intellectuals, scientists, engineers, and technicians—in the capitalist world are becoming more and more convinced that socialism in the U.S.S.R. means a mighty growth of the productive forces, that it means the continuously growing welfare of the broadest masses of the people, that it means an unprecedented rise in their cultural level, that it means the all-round development of human personality, that it means the birth of a new man, a new life, a new psychology. Socialism is peace and

fraternity between the peoples. And for this very reason, all that is honest, independent and free among mankind is despite all difficulties rallying with the working class to the united front against fascism, this plague of modern humanity.

QUESTION: What have you to say about Ribbentrop's claim that he assisted in securing your liberation?

DIMITROFF: In making such a statement, Ribbentrop, to put it mildly, exaggerates the role played in history by his own personality. As everybody knows, my Bulgarian comrades and I were liberated from prison because even a fascist court could not do other than acquit us. It acquitted us because it was proved up to the hilt at the Leipzig trial that the Reichstag was fired, not by the Communists, but by the German fascists. We were liberated because the wave of indignation against the crimes of German fascism rose so high throughout the world, and fascism so disgraced itself and made itself such a laughing stock at Leipzig, that nothing was left for it but to expel us from the country. But where does Ribbentrop come in here? If the Ribbentrops could have torn me to pieces at Leipzig, they would have done so with the greatest of pleasure, but they were powerless. The bandit who lets his victim go because his hands are held down by people who rush to the aid of his victim can boast least of all of his own magnanimity.

Ribbentrop tries to depict the program of the united fighting front against the capitalist offensive, fascism and war which was developed at the Seventh Congress openly before the whole world, as a world terrorist plot not only against fascist Germany but against the whole of Europe and especially against the British Empire. And it would seem that this terrible calamity took place as a result of the "British liberal outlook and German complacency and magnanimity", which, as Ribbentrop assures us, led to my liberation. Ribbentrop needs all this lying balderdash to persuade British public opinion not to repeat such a "mistake" as my liberation, and in order to set the hands of German fascism free to wreak vengeance on Thaelmann and the other prisoners in German dungeons. He deliberately distorts the decisions of the Seventh Congress so as to distract attention from the real plotters and terrorists who are trying to drag the world into the catastrophe of a new imperialist war. The stenographic record of my speech has been published. It has been read by the workers of all countries, and English lords can also read it. In my report, in conformity with the program and the tactics of the Communist International, not only did I not speak as a supporter of individual terror, but I fought with all the passion of a fighter for communism against those who have made the weapon of political individual terror the basic method of achieving their anti-popular aims. I have in view first and foremost the German fascists.

There is no doubt that serious danger is looming more than ever before over the life of Thaelmann and tens of thousands of Communists, Social-Democrats and other anti-fascists imprisoned in German jails and concentration camps. New crimes of fascism are pending. The hand of the fascist butchers must be turned aside. It is up to the millions of workers and all honest people to have their say.

The Sixtieth Birthday of the Glorious Fighter, Wilhelm Pieck

GREETINGS OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE E.C.C.I.

DEAR Comrade Wilhelm Pieck:

On your sixtieth birthday we once more wish to express how close are the ties which bind us to you and to our heroic fighting German Party, the vanguard of the German proletariat.

You have always been particularly closely connected with the Communist International. You are the embodiment of the best traditions of the old working class movement in Germany, in which our great teacher, Lenin, reposed such high hopes.

For forty-two years, you have been working in the very heart of the German working class movement. The whole of your life has been filled with loyalty and love towards the proletariat. As a young carpenter, you took the road of class struggle. Today, you are marching in the front ranks along this road. When reformism secured the upper hand in the German working class movement, you were one of the prominent working class functionaries on whom Karl Liebknecht, Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg could always rely in the struggle against revisionism. When it became necessary for the German working class movement to build up a strong Bolshevik Party, to apply the doctrines of Lenin and Stalin in the interests of the German proletariat, you took part in the front ranks of the struggle, as one of Comrade Ernst Thaelmann's best supporters. In stubborn battles against all the enemies of the working class, against the policy of Noske and Scheidemann, against Right opportunist and anarchist currents, against the weakness and wavering of the Lefts themselves and in particular against the ultra-Left sectarian deviations, you helped, essentially, to create the necessary factors for the establishment of the Bolshevik mass party of the German proletariat. The Bolshevization of the German Party is linked up in the closest fashion with you.

Today, the Communist Party of Germany is confronted with serious and difficult tasks. Under your chairmanship, the first conference of the illegal German Communist Party recently took place in Brussels, which, on the basis of the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, must break through to the broad masses, mobilizing them for the struggle against fascism and setting up the united front and the people's front. The heroic cadres of the German Communist Party who are fighting under conditions of the most bloody fascist dictatorship are proof of the great inner force and determination which the growing Party has acquired. The Party must and will secure the removal of all obstacles which stand in the way of the proletarian united front; it must and will lead the whole of the toiling people of Germany to the victorious

struggle against bloody fascism. It must and will wrench Ernst Thaelmann and all other anti-fascist prisoners from the claws of the hangmen.

Dear Comrade Wilhelm! In the struggle against the chief instigator of war, German fascism, the German and international proletariat have before them the bright torch of your example of courageous action both prior to and during the world imperialist war. On your sixtieth birthday, you stand at the head of the illegal struggle of the German Communist Party, full of the same enthusiasm, the same courage, which distinguished you in the years of your youth. And we express the conviction that you, one of those revolutionaries who by their struggle overthrew the Hohenzollern monarchy, will lead the German proletariat in just the same way, overthrow in battle this cursed fascism, and live to the final victory of the German proletariat.

DIMITROFF	FLORIN	LOZOVSKY
MANUILSKY	WANG MING	BRONKOVSKI
ERCOLI	KOLAROV	KANG SIN
KUUSINEN	LENSKI	TUOMINEN
GOTTWALD	OKANO	MICHAL
MOSKVIN	HECKERT	KELLER

WILHELM PIECK

IT was the evening of July 25, 1935. The Hall of Columns of the Trade Union House was full to overflowing. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International was about to be opened. In the loggia at the side of the platform sat Stalin, the great and beloved leader of the workers and the oppressed throughout the whole world. The stormy ovation continued unabated.

Wilhelm Pieck, the leader of the German Bolsheviks, opened the Congress. The eyes of all present in the Hall of Columns were turned with pride and joy towards him. Lenin and Stalin have brought into being an iron guard of Bolshevik leaders in the capitalist countries. Comrade Pieck is one of the best of them.

In the person of Pieck standing on the platform of the Congress we have the embodiment of the indissoluble tie which exists between world communism and the past and present of the entire working class movement of Western Europe. Pieck enjoys exceptional authority among tremendous masses of the Social-Democratic workers also. They know Pieck and believe in him.

Wilhelm Pieck is not only the leader of the detachment of the world communist movement which is fighting in the front line against German fascism. Pieck is not only the embodiment of the entire path traversed by the glorious Communist Party of Germany, its past and present. Pieck is one of the most prominent leaders of the working class movement of the world.

The road taken by Comrade Pieck during the course of his life is that of the best, most advanced, and revolutionary section of the German working class. On January 3, 1936, Pieck was 60 years old, and for over 40 of these years he has been an active fighter in the ranks of the German working class movement. They are 40 years of incessant struggle against the class enemy and against their reformist agents among the working class.

Comrade Pieck is a model of a Bolshevik leader of the masses. By long years of work and struggle he has proved his profound loyalty to the working class cause. This loyalty has been tested in battles. His authority is based upon the fact that very wide masses of the working class regard him as their leader, and have been convinced by many years of experience that he is a capable leader.

Together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, Pieck founded the Communist Party of Germany. Together with the leader of the German proletariat, Thaelmann, Comrade Pieck has worked as his true comrade-in-arms to Bolshevize the Party, to transform it into a mass Bolshevik Party with hundreds of thousands of members and millions of supporters.

March, 1933. Hitler is in power. Ferocious fascist bands are torturing and killing the best people of the German working class. The leader of the Party, Ernst Thaelmann, is in prison. Pieck takes his post at the helm of the Party; he leads it into the struggle against the fascist dictatorship.

For three years now the fascist dictatorship has been holding sway in Germany. These have been years of great trial. Until recently, such powerful organizations as Social-Democracy and the free trade unions fell to pieces at the first onslaught of the enemy. The Communist Party alone remained firm as a rock. Its forces, though leading, are not for one moment losing their contacts with the mills and factories, not for one moment ceasing their work and their struggle. These glorious, courageous Party forces have been trained by Ernst Thaelmann and his close comrade-in-arms, Comrade Pieck.

* * *

When, as a young wood-worker, Wilhelm Pieck began his active political life, the German working class movement was passing through the stormy heyday of its development. This was in the middle of the nineties of last century. The Social-Democratic Party and the free trade unions penetrated into the heart of the working masses, and became the largest working class organizations on the European continent.

These years it was that saw the beginning of the degeneration of these organizations in the direction of reformism. German capitalism was becoming more and more full-blooded and was passing on to the imperialist period of its development. The labor aristocracy was beginning to be created, and in the mass organizations the type of bureaucrat

was growing up who had settled down and was now somewhat afraid of storms and battles.

On the borderline of the present century, reformism in Germany took shape as a finished ideological current which as the years went by won over more and more of the leading cadres of the trade union and party organizations. The group of Left radicals led by Rosa Luxemburg expressed the protest of the Social-Democratic workers against this degeneration to reformism.

The Left wing in pre-war German Social-Democracy had a number of centers where it enjoyed the greatest influence. The most important of these was Bremen. Between 1905 and 1910, Pieck was one of the secretaries of the Bremen Social-Democratic organization, and was already then the closest comrade-in-arms of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring.

When the Communist Party put forward Pieck's candidature for Bremen in the Reichstag elections in 1932, the Bremen Communist newspaper, *Arbeiter Zeitung*, gave detailed information concerning the role played by Pieck in Bremen during the pre-war years, and added:

"If the pre-war Social-Democratic organization in Bremen was Left radical, it won this glory chiefly in consequence of the work carried on by Pieck."

The year 1908. The Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in Nuremberg. On the order of the day was the question of the famous agreement between Bebel and Legien regarding the May Day strikes. Actually this agreement was "a noose to strangle the May Day strike" (Rosa Luxemburg). Rosa was against the agreement. The whole reformist fraternity led by Robert Schmidt, the theoretician of the General Commission of the Trade Unions, hurled themselves at Rosa. Pieck offered a sharp retort to Schmidt's attacks against Rosa, declaring that he did not consider Schmidt a Party comrade.

"The Party has every ground for resisting those who during the last few years have been systematically endeavoring to turn the workers away from the right road. They are trying to lead the workers on to the road which does not lead to the winning of power. This road is only of use in giving certain Right Social-Democrats and liberals the opportunity to voice their social-reformist endeavors."

On the question of the May strike, Pieck said the following:

"The trade unions have repeatedly declared that the May Day strike is of no use, but even brings harm. However, the lockouts by the employers just show what advantages the May Day strikes will bring to the working class movement. Would the employers have declared these lockouts if they had not been afraid of the tremendous agitational importance of the May strike? I do not agree with the method of sending deputations to the employers, requesting that they kindly allow the men not to turn up at their work on May 1. It must be made clear to the workers that it is not with the permission of the employers, but

against their will, that they should celebrate their May Day by not going to work. If the May Day strike has not been so large as we wished, it is because of the attempts made to prevent it and the resistance offered to it in the trade unions. . . . The main thing is not to retreat in fear before the bourgeoisie. . . ."

In 1912 German Social-Democracy met with a big success at the elections to the Reichstag, obtaining over four million votes. During the first round of the voting only 43 Social-Democratic deputies were elected. For the second round, the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party concluded an agreement with the liberals, in which they promised to mitigate the strong election agitation against the liberals. With the help of this agreement, the Social-Democrats secured 110 seats in the Reichstag.

At the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in Hemnitz, the C.C. reporter, Scheidemann, made a complaint that Pieck in Berlin had spoken against "bartering with the liberals", and had said that "110 deputies have no more power than 43 deputies". Wels, Braun, and others all lined up against Pieck. In his speech, Pieck determinedly repulsed these gentlemen.

Between 1910 and 1915 Pieck worked in Berlin in the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party as one of the secretaries of the cultural department. During these years he became the organizer of the Berlin Lefts. In 1915 Ebert and Co. removed Pieck from his work for taking part in the struggle against war.

Then came August, 1914. German Social-Democracy capitulated to the imperialist desires of the bourgeoisie, and converted the workers' organizations into recruiting stations of the German General Staff. From the very first day Pieck was among the vanguard of revolutionary fighters against war. The "International" group (subsequently known as the "Spartacus Group") entrusted Pieck with the leadership of anti-war agitation among the Berlin workers.

On May 28, 1915, Pieck organized the first anti-war street demonstration of the Berlin workers before the Reichstag. This demonstration made a tremendous impression in Berlin and throughout the country. The police cruelly hurled themselves upon the demonstrators and arrested Pieck on the spot. He was held in prison until far into the autumn of 1915, and was then despatched to the front, to the front line. Here Comrade Pieck was court-martialled, but he was successful in fleeing to Holland, where he continued his revolutionary work. He took part in the work of the *Kampf*, which was printed in Holland and illegally transported to Germany. Several times Pieck illegally crossed the German frontier.

In October 1918, Pieck finally returned to Berlin, where he worked in constant touch with Karl and Rosa until the last hours of their lives. Later when they were brought to the famous "Eden Hotel", Comrade Pieck was brought there together with them, but not being recognized by the whiteguard officers, he succeeded in escaping.

In October 1918, immediately upon his arrival in Berlin, Pieck, together with Karl Liebknecht, worked on behalf of the Spartacus Union

among the "revolutionary shop stewards" of the Berlin factories who, in the majority of cases, were under the influence of the "independents", and energetically mobilized the workers for mass revolutionary action. Liebknecht and Pieck were both members of the Executive Committee of the Berlin "Revolutionary Stewards". There they made passionate appeals for the organization of the revolution, and did everything possible to mobilize the Berlin factories.

During the revolutionary days of November 1918 Pieck with Karl and Rosa spoke at all the big meetings organized by the Spartacus League. During the battles in January 1919 Pieck and Liebknecht fought, rifle in hand, together with the revolutionary sailors against Noske's counter-revolutionary detachments.

During the period before the formation of the Communist Party of Germany, Comrade Pieck belonged to the group of German Lefts, who committed a number of semi-Menshevik mistakes. Talking of these mistakes, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Of course, the Left wing in Germany have something else besides serious mistakes to record. They also have great and important revolutionary acts to their credit. I have in mind a whole series of services and revolutionary acts in connection with questions of internal policy and, in particular, of electoral struggle, on the question of parliamentary and non-parliamentary struggle, on the general strike, on war, on the Revolution of 1905 in Russia, etc. That was precisely why the Bolsheviks regarded them as a Left wing, supported and urged them forward. But this does not and cannot remove the fact that the Left-wing Social-Democrats in Germany did commit a whole series of very serious political and theoretical errors, that they had not yet thrown off their Menshevik burden and therefore needed very serious criticism on the part of the Bolsheviks."*

Later, in the course of his struggle in the ranks of the Communist movement, Comrade Pieck successfully overcame these mistakes and became a true disciple of Lenin and Stalin.

From November 11, 1918, Pieck became a member of the Central Committee of the Spartacus Union, and at the foundation congress of the Communist Party of Germany at the end of 1918, he was elected to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

Since then Pieck has been a regular member of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Germany, enjoying very great popularity and confidence among the German working masses.

During all the years of the existence of the Communist Party of Germany, Comrade Pieck has shown his deep loyalty to the Communist International.

For many years Comrade Pieck was directly in charge of the Berlin organization of the Communist Party of Germany. Under his leadership, the Berlin organization grew into a mass organization, and developed contacts with the factories and workshops.

* Stalin, "Some Questions Regarding the History of Bolshevism," *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 452, International Publishers, New York.

During the years of the crisis the fascist menace grew. Comrade Pieck drew attention to the existence of this danger, and called for joint action by the Communist and Social-Democratic workers.

At the end of 1931, the Bruening government issued the emergency decree reducing wages of all workers and clerks by 10-12 per cent. The leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions gave the decree their unreserved support. The Communist Party did not succeed in mobilizing the masses against the decree. The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany which took place in February 1932 discussed the lessons of this failure. Ernst Thaelmann delivered a speech which was conclusive in content and form, in which he concentrated the attention of the whole Party upon the need for fighting against fascism. Comrade Pieck also spoke at this meeting, and said that the failure of the Party to organize the resistance of the masses against the emergency decree was an alarming symptom.

"We have a situation where fascism may come to power in Germany without the Communist Party successfully organizing any serious resistance. It is extremely probable that the fascists will deliver a blow at our Party, and the Party will be unable to lead the masses into the struggle. This is quite possible."

A year later, January 20, 1933, Hitler was at the head of the German government. Tens of thousands of Communists were arrested, and subjected to unheard of tortures and murder. Until the very last minute, until the day when the Reichstag was set fire to, Pieck spoke openly at meetings, calling upon the working masses to set up a united front and to resist.

On February 10, 1933, the funeral took place of three young anti-fascists killed by fascists. The cemetery was surrounded by policemen and storm detachments. Comrade Pieck delivered a powerful and passionate speech. The leaders of German Social-Democracy had just rejected the proposal of the Communist Party to establish a united front. Said Pieck:

"The three comrades who have fallen at the hands of the fascists were fighters in the ranks of the working class Red Front to free the proletariat, the toiling masses from poverty and slavery, from all the sufferings to which the working class is addicted. The blood of these comrades shed in the struggle to free the working class must give us the strength to hammer out a united front now in the struggle against hunger, war and fascism. Class comrades, friends! Now is the last moment. The working class must find the road to unity, to joint struggle!"

Then began the period of exceptionally difficult work underground. Comrade Pieck was untiring in welding together the ranks of the Party, the ranks of the fighters against the bloody fascist dictatorship.

During all these years, Comrade Pieck has taken an active and leading part in all the work of the Comintern. At the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Pieck was elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern. At the Seventh Congress, he was the re-

porter on the first point of the agenda. He was elected to the Executive Committee, and became one of the secretaries of the Comintern—being one of those people, as Comrade Dimitroff puts it, "who not out of a sense of discipline, but out of profound conviction, assimilate the new line and decisions of the Congress and are ready and capable of carrying them out in practice".

* * *

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International placed before the Communist Party of Germany the task of creating a united proletarian front and an anti-fascist people's front of all toilers to fight against the fascist dictatorship. The Seventh Congress called upon the Communist Party of Germany to take the new road, to resort to new methods of work in mobilizing the masses in defense of their own direct political and economic interests and for the overthrow of the hated fascist regime.

German fascism is experiencing great difficulties. For the first time it can be recorded that the peasant masses are beginning to fall away from fascism. The unrest in the factories is coinciding with the growth of discontent among the petty-bourgeois masses. The near future promises a further sharpening of food difficulties and increased discontent and resistance among all toiling sections of the population.

The task of the Communist Party is to use all these difficulties to mobilize the masses, to organize the struggle. The Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Germany which took place in Brussels in October 1935 carefully analyzed the work of the Communist Party during the years of the fascist dictatorship and concretely laid down the work for the near future.

At this conference, where Comrade Pieck was elected chairman of the Party for the duration of Comrade Thaelmann's arrest, it was stressed that side by side with the struggle against Right opportunism, it is essential that the line of fire should be intensified against sectarianism, which does everything to hinder the rallying of the forces of the proletariat. The election of Comrade Pieck is the guarantee that the line of the Seventh Congress will be correctly carried out by the Communist Party of Germany.

The Communist Party of Germany, led by Comrade Pieck, is waging a stubborn struggle for the release of Comrade Thaelmann, who has become the symbol of the anti-fascist struggle throughout the world. Communists and workers of all countries greet Comrade Pieck, the closest comrade-in-arms of Thaelmann, on his sixtieth birthday. And the best way to celebrate this day will be to increase the struggle for the release of Comrade Thaelmann from the bloody dungeons of German fascism.

Not only the working class of Germany, but the working class throughout the whole world, are proudly and hopefully watching the heroic struggle of the German Communist Party, and send greetings to Comrade Pieck, the leader of the German Bolsheviks, on his sixtieth birthday.

The International Proletariat Is Collecting Its Forces

THE international proletariat met the new year with a feeling of great hope and an appreciation of all the importance of the tasks facing it.

The international working class movement is turning one of the most difficult corners of solving the task of uniting all the forces of the proletariat for the class struggle, which alone can crush the power of barbarous fascism where it has already conquered, and successfully block the fascist menace in other capitalist countries.

The sharpening of the contradictions of the capitalist system, which has already found reflection in the robber onslaught by the Japanese and Italian imperialists against the peoples of Ethiopia and China, threatens to bring fresh colossal misfortunes to mankind, already tortured by hunger, poverty, unemployment and long years of economic crisis. War is knocking at every door, and first and foremost counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. For purposes of war, fascism is conducting a furious campaign of lies and hatred against international communism and the great land of socialism, the U.S.S.R. For purposes of war, fascism is striving to fan the flames of chauvinist passion among the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. Deception, demagogic, terror and provocation are the weapons of class enslavement which have been perfected by fascism, all for purposes of war.

But the world is split into two camps, and mankind sees the magnificent edifice of victorious socialism, approaching completion, sees the hope of the future in the world historic victories of the U.S.S.R., which prove the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

The year 1935 was the third year of the Second Five-Year Plan. On the threshold of the Second Five-Year Plan, Comrade Stalin, the great architect of socialism, called for the enthusiasm for building to be supplemented by enthusiasm to master the new technical processes and set the task of making a new and mighty spurt in the second half of the Second Five-Year Plan, both in the sphere of construction and in the sphere of the additional increase in industrial production. To create the necessary pre-conditions for this new advance, to raise socialist competition to a new and higher stage, Comrade Stalin pointed to the main link: "Cadres decide everything." Under the leadership of our great Stalin, the Bolshevik Party, in 1935, secured tremendous successes on all sections of the great front of socialist construction and showed once more that there are no fortresses which the Bolsheviks cannot take.

The new man—the Stakhanov worker—the product of *victorious socialism*, stands in all his magnificence as the builder of the classless, socialist society, who is conscious to the full of the public, socialist importance of his labor, on the basis of industry freed from capitalist fetters and labor freed from capitalist slavery.

"The Stakhanov movement, which has developed during the Second Five-Year Plan on the basis of socialist competition, when the collective farms have become strong, when industry has been put on its legs, when even transport, which had lagged behind, has begun steadily to climb upward, the Stakhanov movement already expresses what is new in our country, expresses a prosperous, socialist life, expresses the triumph of the ideas and aims, the cares and labors of the great founders of our Party and the Land of Soviets—Lenin and Stalin."*

How long is it since the international bourgeoisie was predicting the imminent, "inevitable" downfall of the Soviet government? How long is it since the theoretician of the Second International, Karl Kautsky, and the Russian Mensheviks, Martov and Sukhanov, were crowing about the "illegitimate birth" of the socialist revolution in Russia, the miserable land of wooden shacks, which had only just thrown off its semi-barbarian slavery under the tsars? Russia, they said, had not yet arrived at such heights of development of the productive forces as rendered socialism practicable; how was it possible to build socialism with such an uncultured proletariat? Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the genius and leader of the proletariat, showed that power in the hands of the working class is itself the shortest way to "civilizing" the proletariat.

"If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say precisely what this definite 'level of culture' is), why can we not first begin by winning the pre-conditions for this definite level by revolutionary means, and only *then*, on the basis of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, move forward to catch up with the other peoples."**

This was the reply that the great revolutionary offered to the bankrupt philistines.

Miserable, impoverished, impotent Russia exists no more. There exists a mighty proletarian power, there is a highly-cultured, heroic people of Stakhanovs and Krivonoses, Kamanins and Molokovs, Demchenkos and Geldyevs, parachutists, tractorists, combine-workers, invincible fighters in the Far East. The remarkable historic prognosis of the leaders and organizers of socialist construction—Lenin and Stalin—has become a reality, on the basis of the unwavering prosecution of the general line of the Party, in relentless struggle against all deviations from Leninism, against all who sabotaged the general line of the Party, in the hitherto unseen flowering of the creative initiative of the toiling masses of the socialist town and socialist village. The land of the Soviets, calumniated and lied about for 18 years, is surrounded by an unequalled halo in the eyes of all the oppressed, exploited and destitute of the capitalist world, and is generally recognized as the most reliable and

* Kaganovich, Report to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., on December 22, 1935.

** Lenin, "Concerning Our Revolution". *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII, p. 400. Russian Edition.

strongest defender of peace and of the liberty of the people, against fascism.

Meanwhile, contradictions are developing in the capitalist world, which the bourgeoisie are incapable of solving. The mechanism of capitalist production, in the words of Engels, "is breaking down under the weight of the productive forces it has itself created". At no time during the whole period of the crisis and the special kind of depression, was the growth of the capitalist economy so bent to serve the war preparations as in 1935. This is particularly noticeable in the example of fascist Germany.

At the same time, even now the productive capacity of the enterprises, which has grown thanks to rationalization, is very little utilized in all the capitalist countries. Moreover, the rate at which the number of workers engaged in industry is increasing continues to lag more and more behind the rate at which production is growing, in consequence first and foremost of the introduction of rationalization at the expense of the working class. The increase in the payrolls universally lags behind the increase in the number of workers engaged. The bestial physiognomy of capitalist rationalization reveals its hungry grin to tens of millions of unemployed. In spite of the fact that a section of the unemployed in the United States, Germany and England have found work, unemployment is still, as before, a millstone round the neck of the capitalist world.

Fascism, especially German fascism, which by deception and demagogic had attracted considerable masses of the more backward unemployed during the period of its advent to power, is now faced with the menacing prospect that the once more swelling army of unemployed will become the active hotbed of a mighty anti-fascist movement. If in the more acute moments of the crisis, the bourgeoisie stood in panic before the uncontrollable avalanche of unemployment, the feeling of comparative calm which arose with the first indications of an improved economic situation is now giving way to new concern in view of the fact that millions still remain unemployed as before.

The International Labor Office of the League of Nations itself acknowledges the fact that the bourgeoisie is incapable of coping with the problem of unemployment, when it declares that unemployment can only be eliminated "on an international scale".

All this shows the instability of the basis of the present rise in capitalist production. In Germany, where it has become particularly obvious that the fascist policy of autarchy has broken down, where financial and food difficulties are growing, the bourgeoisie is openly sounding the alarm in spite of the fascist threats to deal severely with "panic-mongers". Peter Kleckner, a prominent representative of the heavy industries, declared the following at a general meeting of company shareholders on November 3:

"The improvement for the iron and steel industry on the home market which began 18 months ago is a quantitative situation. The prices on the home market have not risen. Over-

burdening factors have become still greater. Export brings losses. Financial consolidation is essential in order to meet the recession blows."

Even the miserable fascist press is compelled to record these ripening recession processes, revealing thereby the disparity between the tasks which the fascist dictatorship has proudly taken upon itself in promising to liquidate the crisis, and the concrete possibilities of capitalist rule.

The bourgeoisie is seeking a way out in war. Italian fascism is conducting a bloody war against the small Ethiopian people who are heroically defending their independence, not only because Ethiopia is the direct, nearest object of its colonial longings, but also in order to create a jumping-off ground for itself for the "great" fight that is approaching between the imperialist robbers, and to distract the attention of the masses away from the difficulties of the fascist regime at home.

German fascism, which has improved its political position abroad by playing upon the contradictions of the imperialists around the Italo-Ethiopian war, is striving to gain time and to make use of the wavering positions of the different imperialist powers. The internal position of German fascism may, however, force it to hurl itself into military adventures sooner than the fascist dictatorship itself "plans" it.

The efforts of British imperialism are directed towards securing a free hand in Europe for action in the Pacific, where Japanese aggression in China has openly placed the basic imperialist contradictions on the order of the day. The internal situation of the British Empire and the fear for the integrity of its colonial possessions are factors leading to a more aggressive policy on the part of British imperialism.

The polarization of the internal forces in France, which is more acute there than anywhere else in capitalist Europe, is making the line of the foreign policy of the French bourgeoisie more and more unstable.

* * *

Serious changes have taken place during 1935 in the relation of class forces on an international scale. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International pointed out that changes in the relation of forces in favor of the growth of the forces of revolution are taking place first and foremost as a result of the brilliant victories of the U.S.S.R. Moreover, account must be taken of the fact that after the heroic revolutionary battles of the Austrian and Spanish proletariat in 1934, after the successful resistance offered by the French proletariat to the onslaught of fascism this year, the working masses are becoming more and more imbued with the consciousness of the possibility of offering victorious resistance to fascism and of the need for united action by the working class, without which fascism cannot be conquered.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the historic report by Comrade Dimitroff have awakened the idea of the united front in the minds of vast masses of Social-Democratic workers. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International in itself, and its

tactical line, have raised a feeling of confidence in their own strength among broad masses of the proletariat. Faith in the might of the bourgeoisie, in the invincibility of the fascist dictatorship, a faith built up by the theories of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy regarding a whole historic epoch of fascism and reaction, has now been undermined. And if 1934 was the year which saw the first wave of open resistance to advancing fascism—in Austria, Spain and France—the year 1935 was the year which saw the international working class seriously beginning to bring about a great rallying of its forces against fascism.

Fascism still has quite a few reserves left for maneuvering. But there is not the slightest doubt that for the first time since the stormy upsurge of the fascist movement in Germany in 1930, the prestige of fascism on the international arena is beginning to fade. The unpopular war of Italian fascism in Ethiopia, military difficulties, the growth of the difficulties inside the country, have lowered its authority among the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. The authority of German fascism is declining; in the face of the hungry winter through which the German people are passing, it has been forced to threaten, through Schacht, that "we are all in the same boat, after all, and nobody will be able to leap out of it". In 1935 the difficulties became greater for fascism. But precisely because the difficulties facing fascism are growing its aggressive attitude and the menace it represents are also growing. Fascism is re-grouping its forces. Its methods are becoming more severe. This is why the struggle against fascism, against fascist dictatorship must be developed on a still wider scale and why our vigilance must be increased in relation to the fascist danger in all the capitalist countries.

The advent of fascism to power in Germany has had tremendous consequences for the entire working class movement in capitalist Europe. The loss of authority by German fascism will doubtless likewise meet with an echo throughout the capitalist world. The toiling masses of the German regions in the various capitalist countries which surround Germany, who now feel obliged to send parcels of food by post to their brothers in need, who are groaning under the fascist yoke, will hardly be delighted at the news emanating from fascist Germany. In Germany itself conditions are becoming more and more favorable for bringing about a real people's anti-fascist front. The task facing the Communist Parties, facing all active anti-fascists, is by persistent activity to utilize and accelerate this decline of the influence of fascism, but not to trust to things developing automatically, nor to comfort themselves with illusions about the rate and degree with which the masses of the petty bourgeoisie will be leaving fascism, but to ever widen the fissures in the fascist regime.

"It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by necessarily, though only carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every 'fissure', however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the vari-

ous countries, among the various groups or types of the bourgeoisie in the various countries; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even temporary, though this ally be vacillating; unstable, unreliable and conditional."*

The activity of the proletariat is also growing in the sphere of economic struggle: the struggle of the working masses for *bread* against the efforts of the capitalists of all countries to improve the economic situation at the expense of further reducing the standard of living of the proletariat. There is as yet no broad wave of strikes, but a gigantic miners' strike is already on the order of the day in England, and in several other capitalist countries the strike activity of the masses is growing. The Communists have never given way to the reactionary theories of the leaders of the Amsterdam trade unions of the impossibility of carrying on successful strike struggles in the conditions of the world economic crisis. But there is no doubt whatsoever that the certain increase in the number of workers employed, the revival in a number of industries, enhance the possibility of extending the economic struggles of the proletariat. The year 1936 should be a turning point in the work of the Communists and of all united front bodies among employed and unemployed workers on behalf of the urgent economic interests of the proletarian masses, a task that has been impermissibly neglected. Without the most active, most stubborn struggle for the daily, vital interests of the working class, as Comrade Dimitroff declared at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, there is no, nor can there be any, real united front of the working class.

The year 1935, due to the initiative of the Communist International, marked a great change in the struggle for the united front of the working class. Since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, there have been no small successes in connection with the united front in a number of capitalist countries. On the basis of a broad united front policy, the role of the Communist Parties as a *political factor* is beginning to grow. We see this in France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia and other countries. The growth of the Communist Parties is steadily continuing in those countries where they are meeting with success in the establishment of the united working class front. Vast masses are becoming more and more convinced of the fact that the Communist International is the center of the struggle against imperialist war and the hated fascism. They are becoming convinced that the Soviet Union is the greatest bulwark of freedom and peace for the peoples.

The new tactical line laid down by the Communist International has already considerably helped to clear the way for the establishment of the united front. The practical application of this line is already setting in motion growing resistance by the Social-Democratic workers and party officials, who are going through a process of revolutionization, to the policy of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy. But many difficulties still lie on the road to the united front. The leaders of the

* Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, p. 52, International Publishers, New York.

Second International, hiding behind the most reactionary leaders of five of its sections, have rejected the proposals of the Communist International for a united fighting front against the war of Italian fascism in Ethiopia. The resistance of the Second International to the united front still continues. Comrade Dimitroff's warning at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International concerning the difficulties and possible dangers to be met with in launching the united front has been fully justified in practice. Practical experience has shown that the extent to which the forces of the proletariat are really mustered and how far the united front meets with success depend both upon the extent to which sectarianism is overcome and upon the extent to which Right opportunist distortions of the line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International are averted.

The Communist Parties must, particularly now, remember Comrade Dimitroff's words at the Congress that "joint action with the Social-Democratic parties and organizations requires that the Communists exercise serious and substantiated criticism of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and untiringly explain to the Social-Democratic workers in a comradely way the program and slogan of communism".* The process of differentiation between the Social-Democratic workers and functionaries who are moving towards revolution, on the one hand, and the reactionary leaders on the other, is increasing in all the Social-Democratic Parties, true, not at an even rate. While doing their utmost to advance every positive action on the part of Social-Democracy in favor of the united front, the Communists, in the interests of the united front, in the interests of assisting *all supporters of the united front in the ranks of Social-Democracy*, are duty bound just as energetically to reveal to the masses the meaning of all actions of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy in opposition to the united front.

The international proletariat responded with great enthusiasm to the call of Comrade Dimitroff. Putting into effect the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International with all Bolshevik firmness and consistence, fighting determinedly against sectarianism, and rooting out all attempts at opportunist distortion of these decisions, the Communists have entered upon a new year of revolutionary struggle firmly convinced that the success of the united working class front is near at hand, and the victory of the working class throughout the world is not far distant.

* G. Dimitroff, *The United Front Against Fascism and War*, p. 55. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

For the Correct Carrying Out of the Line of the Seventh World Congress

TOWARDS THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By K. GOTTWALD

[*The questions raised by Comrade Gottwald in this article are of importance far beyond the boundaries of Czechoslovakia; they are of international significance. The lessons for the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia contained in this article are of great importance for all other Sections of the Communist International.—Editorial Board.*]

IN the German regions of Czechoslovakia, the starvation disease, pellagra, has made its appearance. According to official data, the number of unemployed in Czechoslovakia in the month of December, 1935, amounted to 800,000, i.e., considerably exceeded the figures for December, 1934. These two truly alarming facts speak more eloquently than whole volumes of the extremely serious position of the toiling people of Czechoslovakia and constitute a grave indictment of the existing regime. If today the parties in the government are talking about a "national catastrophe", they must be told quite clearly: *you are responsible and it is a serious responsibility.*

Stoupal, Beran and Vrany—the representatives of the ruling agrarian party—still continue to weave their secret intrigues by negotiating with the opposition reactionaries, Stribrny, Kramar, Henlein, and Hlinka. Once more the reactionary fascist bloc, which originated in December of last year and was about to fall to pieces during the presidential elections, is beginning to take shape, under the very noses of the Social-Democratic ministers. In the near future we may expect new attacks by fascist reaction, which is steadily striving to achieve its aims of seizing full power and gaining an opportunity of dealing severely with the whole of the working class movement. The efforts of the die-hard reactionaries and fascists inside and outside of the government to set up a fascist dictatorship in Czechoslovakia are combined with their endeavors to change the course of the foreign policy of Czechoslovakia, to break off relations with the U.S.S.R., and to establish contacts with fascist Berlin, in a word, to go over from the camp of peace to the camp of the warmongers.

It is these questions, chiefly, which are bringing the different groups of fascist reaction closer together, regardless of differences in nationality. From this angle it is easiest of all for the Czech patriots, Kramar and Vrany, to come to agreement with their "eternal enemies" Henlein and Brandt, and for the "truly Slovene" Slovaks, Hlinka and Sidor, to come to terms with the Hungarian Uriemberek (natural masters)—Count Eshterkazy and Shent-Iwany.

Pellagra in the Sudetta; increased unemployment throughout Czechoslovakia; the collecting and shaping of the forces of fascist reaction for a determined blow against all that is proletarian and progressive; the danger that Czechoslovakia will be drawn by fascist reaction into a war front under the leadership of Hitler—these are the serious facts and dangers which confront the toiling people of Czechoslovakia today. These are facts with which it is impossible to reconcile oneself. We must fight against this danger, and fight, moreover, at once, immediately, day in and day out. And in the process of this struggle we must, without delay, set up a united front of all the workers and all their organizations, and a broad people's front of all sections of the toiling population of town and village. The danger which menaces us can be averted only in this way. Only in this way can we repulse the attacks of capital and fascist reaction, and create the prerequisites for a mighty counter-offensive. And if all the toilers, irrespective of the parties to which they belong, are vitally interested in establishing united working class action and the broad people's fighting front to carry on the struggle against the offensive of capital, fascism and war, then it is clear that everything that hinders the realization of this great work must be overcome and removed.

The Socialist parties in the government are connected with the bourgeoisie. Instead of the class struggle, they pursue a policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. They sit side by side with the agrarians in a Cabinet the Right reactionary wing of which is carrying on negotiations with arrant fascists like Stribrny and Henlein. These governmental Socialist parties are in coalition with the reactionary bourgeoisie and stubbornly reject the united front with the Communists. Both inside and out of the government, they cover up and give their support to the attacks of the bourgeoisie upon the toiling people in the social and economic spheres, and thus add grist to the mill of fascist reaction. They try to smother every attempt on the part of the masses to resist the attacks of the bourgeoisie. *In this, in the class collaboration between the Socialist parties and the bourgeoisie is a great evil for the toiling people.* Why? Because it forces a considerable section of the working class to dance to the tune of the class enemy; because it splits the working class and sets one worker against another; because it demoralizes and weakens the working class politically and ideologically; because it encourages strife between the working class and the toiling peasantry, and leads to the working class being isolated from the other sections of the toiling population. Consequently, class collaboration with the bourgeoisie is the chief stumbling-block in the way of united working class action and the establishment of a broad people's front of all sections of the toiling population *under the leadership of the proletariat.*

It is therefore the task of the Communists to see that the Socialist workers and their organizations, all honest elements in their parties, give up the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and come over to the class struggle. Only as this process is fulfilled will united working class action and the people's front develop, will resistance and fighting power grow in the struggle against the class enemy. And

we must say in advance that here, mere agitation and propaganda in favor of the united front are not enough. This agitation and propaganda must be combined with daily *joint actions* between the Communist and Socialist organizations, and also other proletarian organizations such as the trade unions and cooperatives.

* * *

The decisions of the Seventh World Congress gave to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, as to all the other Sections of the Comintern, the basis for overcoming the split in the working class. The decisions of the Seventh Congress and Comrade Dimitroff's report provide the platform for mobilizing millions. The influence of these decisions upon the toiling masses of Czechoslovakia was unusually great and considerably enlivened the united front movement. The Social-Democratic workers welcomed the new orientation of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. Their confidence in the Communists has grown. Their desire for united action has increased.

The first steps which the Party took along the road to correctly carrying out the new tactical line of the Congress were not bad. As far back as the Seventh Congress the delegation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia concretely applied the decisions to the conditions in Czechoslovakia in a politically correct fashion. The delegation gave a fundamentally correct answer to the most important questions which are worrying the masses of Socialist workers—questions which the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders have abused above all else in order to create confusion in the minds of the workers.

For years the Socialist leaders have been drumming it into the heads of the masses that the Communists pursue a policy of "risky adventure and catastrophe". "It is immaterial to them, the Communists, what regime is in power: democracy or fascism. The principle is: the worse, the better."

Comrade Dimitroff himself gave a definite and clear reply to all calumnious fabrication of this kind in the following words:

"We are not anarchists and it is not at all a matter of indifference to us what kind of political regime exists in any given country: whether a bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy, even with democratic rights and liberties greatly curtailed, or a bourgeois dictatorship in its open, fascist form. Though upholders of Soviet democracy, *we shall defend every inch of the democratic gains which the working class has wrested in the course of years of stubborn struggle, and shall resolutely fight to extend these gains.*" *

And in complete agreement with these words of Comrade Dimitroff, the delegation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia declared the following at the Congress:

"The whole world knows that we Communists are supporters

* *The United Front Against Fascism and War.* Report by Georgi Dimitroff. Workers Library Publishers, New York, p. 107.

of Soviet democracy, the *proletarian* democracy which is the broadest while classes still exist, the democracy which most of all accords to the interests of the toiling people. It is for this democracy that we are fighting. But if fascism encroaches upon *bourgeois* democracy, invades the democratic rights extended to the toiling people and won by them at the cost of a serious struggle, we, of course, will stand in defense of these democratic rights. And if you want us to call this 'defense of democracy', then let it be as you will. We shall not quarrel about names."

Day in and day out the Social-Democratic leaders have persuaded their supporters in the ranks of the working class that the Communists are against the republic and the national independence of the Czechs. It is immaterial, to the Communists, they have said, if Prague becomes a little provincial town in the Hitler "Third Empire".

And we answered this from the tribune of the Seventh Congress, as follows:

"We desire that the republic where the bourgeoisie now hold sway should be a *Soviet* republic, a *Socialist* republic, where the toiling people would hold sway. Such is our aim, and we are fighting for this. But if this *bourgeois democratic* republic should be threatened by bloody fascism, then we shall defend this republic from fascism, and we call on all real Socialists, Democrats and Republicans to establish a united fighting front so as to protect this republic from a tremendous disgrace, and the toiling people from a tremendous catastrophe, from bloody fascist dictatorship. And if we are decisively against handing over this republic to the Czech Hitler bands, then we are no less decisively determined against it falling under the whip of the German Hitlerites. In our struggle against both these groups, we will conclude an agreement with any one whatsoever in defense of the republic against the fascists, within and without the country. However, dear sirs, the republic must make it possible for us to do so. It must provide complete freedom for the organizations of the toilers, it must give freedom to the peoples, it must cease persecuting the workers. It must cease imprisoning Communists and revolutionary workers. If the republic acts in the way it has done hitherto, it itself makes it impossible to secure its *defense*."

The Social-Democratic leaders have constantly asserted that the policy pursued by the Communists on the national question plays into the hands of Hitler, Horthy, and Pilsudski.

To which we have replied that *your* policy (*i.e.*, that of the Social-Democratic leaders) of the national oppression of the non-Czech population is driving the latter into the arms of irredentism.* And if there is anything that can create and strengthen a fraternal alliance between the peoples of Czechoslovakia, it is precisely the establishment of equal rights for all sections of the non-Czech population in all spheres, on social and economic questions, in the sphere of political rights, on questions of school education, languages, culture, etc. The Communists

* Irredentism—*a* movement for the separation of the non-Czech territories and their affiliation, in this case, to fascist countries.—Ed.

have declared hundreds of times that they are against uniting even one single little village with Hitler Germany, with Horthy's Hungary, or fascist Poland. And under conditions of complete and equal rights for all nationalities of Czechoslovakia, the recognition of the right to self-determination would only strengthen the fraternal alliance among the peoples of Czechoslovakia.

The reactionary leaders have frightened the Social-Democratic workers with the idea that the revolutionary program and policy of the Communists are driving the peasantry and middle sections in the towns into the arms of fascism, and that collaboration between the Socialists and Communists would still further increase this danger.

To which we have objected that the very opposite is the truth. It is precisely the policy of coalition between the Socialist parties and the bourgeoisie which is pushing the peasantry and the middle sections of the population in the towns into the arms of the fascist demagogues. Why? Because the Socialists in the government cover up, support, and participate in, the attacks of the bourgeoisie against the toiling peasantry and the middle sections in the towns. Because the whole of the working class is thereby compromised in the eyes of the middle sections of the population. Because, on account of this, the middle sections are losing their faith in the working class, are standing aloof from them, and easily fall victims to the influence of the first fascist adventurists that make their appearance. On the contrary, the establishment of united working class action and the joint struggle not only for the demands of the working class but for the interests of the toiling peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie would afford an opportunity of bringing these sections over to the working class, and would lead to the establishment of a powerful people's front of all toilers against the handful of capitalist robbers. And then fascist demagogy would lose its foothold.

The Socialist leaders finally stated the following: the Communists make it a condition for the united front that we resign from the government. But after us only the fascists can come to power. To this we replied as follows: If by your long years of coalition policy you have brought things to such a pass that the fascists are now on the threshold of taking power, this in itself is a sufficiently weighty proof of the ruinous character of your policy. However, we do not demand your resignation from the government as a condition for concluding the united front with you. But we want at least to fight with you for what you yourselves have promised, and are always promising, to the people. That is the first point. And secondly, the strength of the working class is not in ministerial benches in the bourgeois coalition government. On the contrary, their strength only gets lost there. How? Just think what a price the working class pays for having Socialists participating in the coalition governments of the bourgeoisie. To be tolerated in the government, the government Socialists are compelled to cover up, approve of, and take part in the attacks of the bourgeoisie against the toiling masses. They are compelled to prevent the working class from uniting for the struggle against capital, to prevent the working class from offering resistance to the attacks of capital and reaction.

In other words, for the sake of a few ministerial posts—out of which, incidentally, the bourgeoisie will drive them at a moment's notice without any compunction—the Socialists in the government must hand over the working class, bound hand and foot, to the bourgeoisie. No, the strength of the working class is not in ministerial portfolios in the bourgeois coalition government, but in the factories, in the organizations of the toilers, in the localities, on the streets. The strength of the working class lies in the working class itself. And if these forces are united and led in a broad front to battle, if the working class is freed from all the bonds which tie it to the bourgeoisie, if it conducts an independent class policy, it will shake to the foundations the positions held by the bourgeoisie among other sections of the toilers as well, it will exert strong pressure upon the apparatus of the bourgeois government, so as not to give the bourgeoisie an opportunity of going over to a fascist dictatorship.

The Socialist workers have accepted our new united front policy with enthusiasm. A mighty wave of closer fraternal collaboration has arisen between the Communist and Socialist workers. Even before the Seventh Congress of the Comintern we had quite good contacts with the Social-Democratic workers and their organizations. After the Congress we have considerably increased the number of these contacts. We can say that the majority of our organizations have established contacts in one form or another with the corresponding Social-Democratic organizations. Many joint demonstrations, joint activities, and joint actions have been conducted in which, under the pressure brought to bear by the workers, some of the middle links of the Socialist parties, and primarily the trade union organizations, willy-nilly took part. In a word, it appears that the decisions of the Seventh Congress and the appeal made by Comrade Dimitroff have provided the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia with a powerful lever for mobilizing the masses, for establishing united action, and increasing the fighting efficiency of the toiling people in the struggle against their class enemy.

* * *

Five months have passed since the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is now on the eve of its Seventh Congress, which will be of great importance for the further development of the working class movement in Czechoslovakia. In the center of the work of the Congress will be the question of how to bring about united working class action, trade union unity, and the People's Front of all sections of the toilers, in Czechoslovakia. From this point of view, the policy of the Party for the last few months must be examined and tested, so that in the interest of united action and of raising the fighting ability of the proletariat we may reveal and remove all the weak sides and mistakes which hinder the establishment of united action.

* * *

In his report at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, Comrade Dimitroff said:

"We want our Parties in the capitalist countries to come out and act as real *political parties* of the working class, to become in actual fact a *political factor* in the life of their countries, to pursue at all times an *active Bolshevik mass policy*, and not to confine themselves to *propaganda and criticism, and bare appeals to struggle for proletarian dictatorship.*"

In the same speech Comrade Dimitroff further said:

"We want them [the Communist Parties—K. G.] as quickly as possible to learn how to *sail on the turbulent waters of the class struggle*, and not to remain on the shores as observers and registrars of the surging waves in the expectation of fine weather."

Consequently, the Communists must not be a sect of propagandists, but a *political factor*, and nothing must escape their attention. They must actively intervene in all political problems in their own country, and seek to secure their solution in the interests of the toiling people. Therefore, the Party behaved *correctly* in *not* declaring, on Hodza's advent to power, that: "Until the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, we are not interested in who stands at the head of the government, Hodza or Malypetr: it is immaterial to us." Therefore, the Party was right in *not* adopting the following position when the budget was being debated: "This or any other budget is all the same; we are not interested in what budget the capitalist government will pass." Therefore, the Party was right in *not* declaring, in connection with the presidential elections: "It's all the same to us who becomes president, Benes or Nemetz." Therefore, the Party acted correctly in *not* declaring that: "The foreign policy of the capitalist government is of no interest to us, it is all the same to us what course capitalist Czechoslovakia steers in its foreign policy, towards Berlin or Moscow."

The Communist Party was and is correct when it "does not limit itself" on all these and similar questions, "to a bare appeal to struggle for the proletarian dictatorship", but strives to adopt a *concrete* position on each individual political question, and to propose a *concrete* solution of it. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia left out of account one old truth, namely: for the proletariat to influence the solution of one political question or another in their own spirit, they must operate primarily and mainly by means of *independent mass action from below in the factories, in their organizations, on the streets.*

The Party leadership has asked, implored, invoked and warned everybody possible—deputies, ministers, the government, and the executive committees of the various parties. The Party leadership has done its utmost to persuade Hampel, Czech and Benes. It has done its utmost to prove to them the good intentions of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in the joint struggle against reaction and fascism. But the leadership forgot just one thing, namely, the masses. It forgot the fact that the masses must be appealed to, must be organized and led into independent action from below, the fact that these mass activities make a bigger impression upon all these gentlemen who sit at the top than all the most eloquent efforts at persuasion and arguments.

In short, the Party leadership at times substituted parliamentary combinations in place of the mobilization of and action by the masses. This has nothing in common with the "active Bolshevik mass policy" of which Comrade Dimitroff spoke. And as a result, the Party is not becoming a "political factor in the life of its country" as the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and the interests of the toiling people demand, but on the contrary is objectively, without wanting to do so, facilitating the conduct of the policy of the class enemy, as was revealed for example in the fact that our parliamentary fraction voted for two articles in the state budget (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and social insurance).

This vote was a political mistake. Not because it is a political mistake in *general* to vote for any measures of a bourgeois government. For an occasion may arise when a bourgeois government, under strong pressure from a powerful mass movement, may be forced to propose some measure which accords with the interest of the toiling people, the interests of the anti-fascist struggle and to which all reactionaries and fascists would be opposed. In that case, the Communists, basing themselves upon the mass movement which is demanding that such a measure be adopted, would vote for it. However, there was nothing of this kind when the state budget was voted in the Czech Parliament. In the proposals it brought in, the government did not take account of a single demand of the toiling masses in the spirit of the slogan "make the rich pay". The government did not take a single step against the fascists, not a single step to extend democratic rights; on the contrary, it negotiated and is still negotiating with fascist reaction, and is moving further and further to the right. And by voting for the articles in the budget which it proposed, we ourselves have expressed our confidence in *such* a government. And what is this but tying our own hands, giving up independence in policy, and misleading and confusing the masses?

All the danger of this policy of resorting to parliamentary combinations in place of the independent mobilization of, and action by, the masses, is still more sharply revealed if looked at from the following angle: the reactionary leaders of the Socialist parties in the government base their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the following piece of deception: "All the former methods of class struggle—strikes, demonstrations, actions on the streets, etc.—are behind the times. We have invented much more convenient methods of class struggle. Workers, only try your hardest to get as many votes as possible for us in parliamentary elections, then we shall have a large number of ministers and they will conduct the 'class struggle' for you up there, in the Council of Ministers. And you keep calm, and don't get alarmed, don't let yourselves be dragged into 'irresponsible actions' like demonstrations and strikes. We, up there at the top, will settle everything for you so that you will not have to exert yourselves or take any risks."

As we know, the working class has had to pay, and is still paying, dearly for this sort of policy. And not only because capital and reaction always gain their own ends at the expense of the toilers when the "class struggle" is conducted in this way, but also because this policy blunts the class consciousness of the working masses and deprives them of their fighting ability. Obviously the working class should and must use all the positions at its disposal in parliament, in the local government bodies, etc. However, the source of power of the representatives

of the working class in such and similar bodies lies in the working class itself, in its organizations, in its competence, in its will to fight for the demands it puts forward. Unless the masses are mobilized from below, even the best, even the most honest, representatives of the working class in bourgeois bodies will find themselves powerless. Therefore, in the interests of the whole of the working class, the Communists must not allow the appearance in their policy of even a shade of the shameful tendency to lull the masses with illusions to the effect that anything can be obtained for them "from above", without their own independent intervention, without their own class struggle.

* * *

Is the Party right, in view of the menace of fascism, in having called for, and still calling for, the establishment of an anti-fascist people's front of all anti-fascists, in clearly declaring itself in favor of defending democracy against fascism? It is absolutely correct! Is the Party right, in view of the danger that Hitler Germany may attack Czechoslovakia, in having clearly declared itself in favor, and still declaring in favor today, of defending the republic against foreign fascism? It is absolutely correct! There is not the slightest doubt that this viewpoint has brought us closer to the Social-Democratic workers and made it easier for us to establish unity of action.

But what does it mean—to defend democracy against fascism; what does it mean—to fight to prevent the establishment of a fascist dictatorship? Of course we must concentrate our fire against those reactionary groups of the bourgeoisie that are openly striving to bring about a fascist dictatorship, *i.e.*, against all the Kramars, Stribrny, Stoupals, Henleins. Of course, we must do everything to make sure that the influence of these openly fascist groupings does not grow any stronger, but declines. This, however, can only be achieved provided we fight energetically and determinedly against all those measures, all those steps, adopted by the *present* government which are objectively favorable to fascist reaction and pave the way for fascism.

This is what we must explain to the masses of Socialist workers: every attack made by the present coalition government, in which representatives of your Party take part, against the standard of living of the toiling population, every step taken by this government in the direction of restricting the democratic rights of the masses of the population, such as the maintenance of the censorship, suppression of working class organizations, persecution of working class functionaries, etc., etc.—every blow of this kind weakens the anti-fascist front and helps Stribrny, Henlein and Co. All the more essential then is the joint struggle of all workers and all toilers against such measures adopted by the *present* government. And the Party must organize this struggle and guide it. Moreover, this must be a *concrete, practical and daily* struggle for the *concrete, practical, daily* rights and demands of the toiling population of town and village.

If we really conduct such a struggle, nobody can form the impression that in advancing the slogan of the defense of democracy against fascism the Communists have revised their views in principle concerning

bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois state, and have adopted a policy "acceptable to the state" in the spirit of Social-Democracy. And yet, inevitably, such an impression was bound to be formed in Czechoslovakia. While the Party has said much about defense of democracy and the republic against fascism, it has far less taken account of the poverty, the starvation, the absence of liberties, all the calamities which have befallen the toiling people already under the *present* democracy and in the *present* republic. Of course, under a fascist dictatorship the toilers are subjected to far harder trials. That is true. But it on no account follows that we can reconcile ourselves to the present hardships and blows; the more so since to do so would immediately be the signal for yet heavier blows. It goes without saying that our Party has never anywhere said anything about such reconciliation. But the fact that it has neglected the *concrete* struggle for the *concrete* rights and demands of the people against the *present* regime, puts it in a position dangerously close to that regime in the eyes of the masses.

The point is not that we apparently do not put forward any demands to the present government. It is not that which is important. Demands have been and are being put forward to a sufficient degree. But where we have frequently been found wanting is in *organizing the mass struggle* to achieve the fulfilment of the demands put forward. Here there has been revealed a certain tendency to evade a sharp conflict with the existing regime, not to create any difficulties for the regime, not to sharpen the situation—and all this was alleged to be in the interests of the struggle against fascism. Why did such a strange theory as that of "mitigating the tense class relations" come to the surface. For example, in the *Plamen*, No. 2 of 1935, among other monstrous assertions in an article we read the following:

"Can the class struggle be stopped in capitalist countries? Never. Can we mitigate the strained relations between the classes? We can. If the toiling class will only act unanimously on behalf of their demands. That is, as a result of a retreat by the bourgeoisie."

The author forgets that the bourgeoisie will retreat only if *compelled* to do so. He has also forgotten the circumstance that the united proletariat can force the bourgeoisie to retreat only by *intensifying the class struggle*. Neither does the author understand that when the bourgeoisie has been compelled to retreat, it does not let things rest there, but after regrouping its forces resorts to ever new attacks; and if the proletariat wants to consolidate its gains and secure still more from the bourgeoisie, it must never let its forces become scattered, but, on the contrary, must prepare for further, still more difficult struggles.

It does not occur to the author that all this inevitably *increases the tensity of the class relations*. On the contrary, he talks about the "mitigation" of class relations. What other political idea can this "theory" contain but the naive proposal to the present government to afford an opportunity for compromise to be arrived at between them and us by means of a "reasonable" policy? Is there, then, anything surprising in the fact that the masses, through their healthy class in-

stinct, have sensed "loyal opposition" behind all this devilish stuff? Is it surprising that the impression has been created that on the question of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois state, the Communists have given up their viewpoint in principle and have adopted the platform of Social-Democracy? Is it surprising that this has misled the masses and hindered the establishment of united action? And, consequently, just the opposite has happened to that which the Party has subjectively been trying to achieve.

Probably even more confusion must have been created in the minds of the workers by some statements made by various Party organs on the question of the army and armaments. The Party, obviously, was right when it intervened in affairs concerning the army. Similarly, it was and remains correct for the Party to put forward a number of concrete demands aiming at the democratization of the army, which would make it difficult for the fascists to use the army in their own interests. The proletariat is in the greatest degree interested in seeing that in the struggle against fascism the army is not on the side of the fascists, but on the side of their enemies. It would be short-sighted and a fatal mistake on the part of the working class not to be interested in what is taking place in the army. Thus, the Party was absolutely correct when it demanded that measures be adopted to democratize the army, and when it fought to prevent the army from becoming a hotbed of reaction and fascism. However, it was entirely wrong and impermissible from the proletarian point of view to approve the policy of armaments pursued by the present government, and even to call for an increase in these armaments. And yet, this is what actually took place.

"Not a single honest toiling man in the republic is against the army and against armaments today! The army must be given the best, and we must have armaments! We will all take up arms against fascism that menaces us. And we want these arms to be in as great a quantity as possible; and that they should be the best possible!"

"In the military affairs commission, the Minister of National Defense proposed a program of material demands for supplies to the army. His demands were great, but they are essential. And were it not for the profits that the offsprings of the wealthy put into their pockets...the army would have, instead of one gun, supplied by Czech patriotic munitions manufacturers, two, instead of one aeroplane—two, instead of one machine-gun—two....

"We must all be prepared to sacrifice for the sake of the army. Sacrifices are made by workers, handicraftsmen, peasants, civil servants and officials. They also sacrifice their lives in battle. But they want to be sure that nobody will pocket hundreds of millions gained at the expense of the heavy sacrifices they make."

Anyone who has not seen this with his own eyes would find it difficult to believe that such things could be printed in a Communist newspaper. And yet, this is exactly the case. Take the *Rude Pravo*, central organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, for November 27, 1935, and you will find it there, written by a man who is obviously

alien and hostile to the proletariat and the Party. True, there have been no other similarly monstrous distortions of the class principles of the Party in any other Party utterances. But the fact that after such an unheard-of travesty, the culprit was not immediately with a broom of iron swept out of the Party as an agent of the class enemy shows that there was no clear, consistent, Bolshevik line in the Party on the question of the army.

Comrades apparently have forgotten one of the most important questions, namely, the *class character of the army*. They have forgotten that the question of the class character of the army is determined by the question as to which class holds the reins of *power*; that the bourgeois army remains a weapon of oppression in the hands of the bourgeoisie even when a non-fascist, bourgeois government is in power and even if Socialists are members of this government, and therefore, the working class *cannot approve* the appropriation of funds and armaments to such an army and such a government—otherwise they betray their own class interests. Instead of patiently explaining all this to the workers, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia committed the unheard-of act referred to above.

In this particular case, our comrades obviously fell victims to the agitation of the enemy who had been shouting in every key: "If the Communists really and truly are in favor of the republic, then they must vote for the war budget as well. How else can we defend the republic?" At first sight this may seem logical. But that is only at first sight. Actually things are quite different.

The toiling population of Czechoslovakia want to defend their country against Hitler and other foreign fascists. In this respect can they rely upon the bourgeoisie? Undoubtedly not. We shall not speak of the German and Hungarian bourgeoisie, whose friendly relations with Hitler and Horthy are sufficiently well-known. But what about the Czech and Slovenc bourgeoisie? Are not all these Kramars, Stribrnys, Stoupals and Hlinkas now conspiring with Henlein, flirting with Berlin? Are there no strong reactionary currents in the present government which favor creating a broad reactionary bloc which, on coming to power, would pursue a home and foreign policy that suits Kramar, i.e., a course leading to Berlin? By pursuing their policy of class cooperation, by constantly capitulating to reaction, and rejecting the united front, do not the Socialist parties in the government add grist to the mill of these reactionary efforts? And is it not true that in consequence of this the danger already exists that those who today are shouting louder than anybody else about defending the republic will one fine day sell this republic, lock, stock and barrel, including the army, to Hitler Berlin? How can the toiling people resist this danger? Obviously only by mustering all their forces in an anti-fascist people's front, by setting this front against the forces of the ruling bourgeoisie, by isolating the latter from the people and depriving them of the opportunity of using the armed forces of the country against the interests of the people. Obviously only by *pressing the class struggle against the bourgeoisie*. In these circumstances, what is the meaning of a vote in favor of the war budget of the present government? It means a vote of confidence

in the government, the rejection of the class struggle and, finally, even to hand over the fate of the national independence of the country to people who are clearly not fit for the task of defending it.

Consequently, precisely because we really want to defend the republic from fascism at home and abroad, we shall not vote in favor of giving war credits to the present government and the ruling bourgeoisie, because we know that in the *hands of the bourgeoisie* these funds can always be used not only against the class interests but also against the national interests of the toiling people. *Precisely for this reason* we tell the workers and all the toiling people that the struggle against alien fascism can also virtually be only the class struggle against the bourgeoisie at home. And a *component* part of this class struggle against "one's own" bourgeoisie is the struggle to democratize the army, to secure the destruction therein of all the nests of fascism, to give the soldiers all civil rights, to infuse the spirit of the anti-fascist struggle into the main units of the army, so as to prevent the fascists using the army in the interests of their own and foreign adventurists.

Perhaps some comrades, in determining their attitude towards the government, towards the bourgeois state and the army, were constrained by the present relations between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has now concluded a mutual assistance pact with Czechoslovakia. But does this in any way alter the relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia? Not a whit! The interests of the Soviet proletariat are the same as those of the entire international proletariat. However, the forms and methods of defending these interests may be *different*. This is to be explained by the fact that the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. acts and speaks as a *ruling* class, while the proletariat in all other countries acts as an *oppressed* class. In the given case the government of the Soviet Union has signed an agreement with the ruling bourgeoisie of Czechoslovakia aimed at prolonging peace. This is fully in accord with the interests of the toiling people of all countries. But the *oppressed proletariat* of Czechoslovakia has not concluded *any agreement* on civil peace with the *ruling bourgeoisie* of Czechoslovakia. And the ruling bourgeoisie of Czechoslovakia has not concluded any sort of agreement with the proletariat that it will not use the army against the proletariat. The Czech proletariat, as hitherto, is still interested in throwing off the yoke of capitalism as quickly as possible, just as the bourgeoisie as hitherto is interested in enslaving, exploiting and oppressing the proletariat of Czechoslovakia. Hence it follows that the class relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of Czechoslovakia *have not changed* in consequence of the agreement concluded between the Czech bourgeois government and the U.S.S.R.

This, obviously, applies to the *army* as well. Those who say "our," i.e., the Czech, army is now an ally of the Red Army, therefore you must vote for war credits, simplify the question too much. No, things are not quite so simple.

The toiling people can entrust the army only to such a government as is a *real government of the people*. But is the present coalition government in Czechoslovakia such a government? Not by any means;

the whole world knows that. And, therefore, not everything is in good order as regards this "friendship" with the Red Army. Let us take just one example. The fact that General Wojchechovsky, a former active Kolchak officer, is the Governor-General of Bohemia, is convincing proof of the fact that the Czech army is not led and managed in the interests of the people. At the same time, this fact proves convincingly that the Czech army is not "our" army, *i.e.*, not the army of the toiling people. It is quite another thing when our efforts result in this army *really* becoming our army, the army of the toiling people, the *real ally* of the Red Army. Look at the Soviet Union and you will see what the toiling people can do, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, with their own armed forces. And as for *you*, gentlemen, we shall leave the old slogan in force: "Not a man, not a penny!"

• • •

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was and remains quite correct in declaring quite definitely and proving by a number of political deeds its readiness to establish *unity* of action against fascism and against capital with the Socialist parties as a *whole*, *i.e.*, including the leading bodies. The Party was right in constantly and persistently explaining to the workers the tremendous force which *united action* between the three Socialist parties of Czechoslovakia together with the Communist Party would constitute; how much the fighting ability of the whole of the working class would grow if other organizations as well, and first and foremost the *trade unions*, were to join forces on a class basis; what a magnetic force the proletariat, united in joint action, would become for the masses of the peasantry and the urban middle sections and their organizations, thus rendering it possible to arouse the overwhelming majority of the people against fascism and reaction, *i.e.*, to create thereby a *broad people's front*. The Party was absolutely right in showing the toiling masses this way out of the blind alley into which the toiling people had been driven by the policy of class collaboration pursued by the government Socialists and by constant capitulation to reaction.

When, however, did the lapse occur? When our comrades began to forget that all this—united working class action, trade union unity and the people's front—can only be achieved by overcoming numerous difficulties. And that they can only be attained in the course of stubborn, tense, hard, prolonged struggle. The lapse began when our comrades began to accept their desires as the reality, when they began to imagine that things would move faster if we retreated in the face of difficulties, taking the line of least resistance. Let us give a few examples.

What is it that most of all hinders the establishment of united working class action? The policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. It is precisely owing to this policy that the ranks of the proletariat are split. And the working class must be freed from this poison if it is to become united and strong. The resolution of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern on the report of Comrade Dimitroff quite justly emphasizes the following point:

"5. Joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations not only does not preclude, but, on the contrary, renders still more necessary the serious and well-founded criticism of reformism, of Social-Democracy as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and the patient exposition of the principles and program of Communism to the Social-Democratic workers."**

The leaders of the government Socialists in Czechoslovakia characterized our new tactical line as capitulation to Social-Democracy, *and as going over to its position*. At first the Social-Democratic workers were not clear on this question. For the Communists talk about defending democracy and the republic against home and foreign fascists. Is this not the same as is done by the Social-Democratic parties which participate in the government? There is no doubt that a section of the Social-Democratic workers asked themselves this question. And instead of patiently explaining to these workers, over and over again, and proving day after day on the basis of concrete examples, that the policy of their party, the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, paves the way for fascism at home and abroad, even though the leaders of these parties swear a dozen times a day that they "will defend democracy and the republic"; instead of showing in an absolutely clear fashion to these honest Social-Democratic workers that the only salvation from fascism, both at home and abroad, lies in consistent class struggle against their own bourgeoisie (which is the very opposite of what their parties have been doing up to now); instead of this, we actually let up on our criticism of the Social-Democratic parties on these fundamental questions. It becomes a favorite expression to declare that "we won't emphasize what divides us, but what brings us together". I agree that we must put forward all that can bring us closer together, but at the same time we must also say, "Let us get rid of everything that prevents our coming closer together!" Class collaboration with the bourgeoisie is a hindrance. And the less the workers heed the preachers of this harmful doctrine of class collaboration, the sooner and the closer will we come together. However, we have often forgotten this point. The government Socialists furiously attacked us on questions of principle. We defended ourselves poorly; and on a number of questions of principle, as already indicated above, we retreated before Social-Democratic ideology. Consequently, we again behaved in exactly the opposite way to that which the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and the interests of the toilers of Czechoslovakia demanded of us.

We must not regard the process of establishing unity of action in a schematic manner, *i.e.*, we must not imagine that the Social-Democratic parties in their entirety will suddenly accept the platform of the united front. It is a question of explaining and altering the outlook inside Social-Democracy; of the struggle of the Social-Democratic workers who are coming closer to the revolution, against the reactionary elements of Social-Democracy, against their reactionary policy. And the Communists must help the Social-Democratic workers in this struggle. How?

* *Resolutions of Seventh Congress of the Communist International*, pp. 28-29. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

We are told this in the resolution of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern on the report of Comrade Dimitroff:

"While revealing to the masses the meaning of the demagogic arguments advanced by the Right Social-Democratic leaders against the united front, while intensifying the struggle against the reactionary section of Social-Democracy, the Communists must establish the closest cooperation with those Left Social-Democratic workers, functionaries and organizations that fight against the reformist policy and advocate a united front with the Communist Party. The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of Social-Democracy, which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of Social-Democracy which is becoming revolutionized."*

And what has been the practice in Czechoslovakia of late? Our comrades simply created such "Left" Social-Democratic leaders. Bechyne once declared frankly that he was against the united front with the Communists and in favor of a united front with the employers. Bechyne undoubtedly is a real reactionary. But then Hampel once said somewhere that "the perspectives of setting up working class unity have improved", and that seems to have been enough for our Czech comrades to convert Hampel into a Left. They were not in the least embarrassed by the fact that Hampel never at any time moved a finger to do anything to bring about the united front. Our comrades converted Hampel into a Left, although this "Left", on the question as to why, as a matter of fact, the perspectives for achieving unity among the workers had improved, gave the ambiguous reply that the policy of the Communists had proven bankrupt, and the policy of Social-Democracy had justified itself, and so, by virtue of this, the conditions have arisen for uniting the working class on the platform of "constructive socialism". In that case, probably all the leadership of Social Democracy can be included among the "Lefts". And it is naive tricks like this, of artificially decking out Rights as Lefts, that have been performed by a number of our editors as regards a number of other leading government Socialists, as, for instance, Tucny, Necas and others.

But are there no real Lefts in the ranks of any of the Social-Democratic parties which take part in the government? Of course, there are many, tens of thousands. There are the functionaries from among the workers, the dissatisfied intellectuals and hundreds of local organizations. It is on these truly Left forces, within the Socialist parties, forces which are moving towards revolution, that the Communists must concentrate their attention, help them to form a strong Left wing, and to conduct a fight against the incorrigible arrant reactionaries, the assistants of the bourgeoisie and enemies of the united front who adopt an attitude towards the members of their organizations, and who rule the roost in their own parties, as a bailiff does on the estate he manages. But what help do we give to the real Lefts when our Party members artificially convert Right reactionaries into Left fighters, convert devils into angels? Indeed, this must mislead the Left Social-Democratic work-

* *Ibid.*, p. 29

ers and officials, must lead them astray and facilitate the maneuvers of the reactionary demagogues who can easily come to the indignant members of their organizations and say: you see, am I so bad after all? Even the Communists are compelled to admit that I am a Left.

The artificial creation of Lefts where there are none, the inability to aim at winning the real rank-and-file Lefts, are all obviously connected with the viewpoint that mere agitation, bare appeals to those at the top, are sufficient for the establishment of united action. This is a serious mistake. How many times have we argued with Hampel, have we tried to persuade him and others like him, how many times have we implored and pleaded with them. We have tried to persuade Hampel in every possible way. But he remained stubborn as a mule. All right, go on persuading Hampel, but do not forget the most important thing, namely: *the need to arouse the masses of the Social-Democratic workers and organizations, to call upon them to establish united action, to organize them and lead them.* Of course, we want Hampel, i.e., the leadership of Social Democracy, to set up unity of action with us. And obviously we appeal to the Social-Democratic workers and their organizations to demand of the leaders of their parties that they conduct a joint struggle with us for the common demands of the toilers against the bourgeoisie. But what are we to do if Hampel refuses to agree? If he likes to associate with the Vranys and Stoupals rather than with the Communists? If for the sake of associating with reactionaries he surrenders one position of the proletariat after another, encourages one attack after another against the working class? If he has learned very little from the experiences of his colleagues Wels and Bauer? What are we to do then? Wait until Hampel sees reason? It may prove a very costly waiting. Well, then, we shall have to act without the Hampels for the time being, to set up a united front without them, to bring about united action against the bourgeoisie without them and against their will. And if these Hampels can be persuaded in any way by anything at all, it is precisely by means of the workers themselves, the members of their parties, their officials, their organizations, confronting the Hampels with the accomplished fact. In the resolution of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern on the report of Comrade Dimitroff we find the following:

*"2. Without for a moment giving up their independent work in the sphere of Communist education, organization and mobilization of the masses, the Communists, in order to render the road to unity of action easier for the workers, must strive to secure joint action with the Social-Democratic parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers against the class enemies of the proletariat, on the basis of short or long term agreements. At the same time, attention must be directed mainly to the development of mass action in the various localities conducted by the lower organization through local agreements."**

What is the situation in Czechoslovakia? We have several times made proposals to the Social Democratic parties and trade unions to

* *Ibid.*, p. 27.

conclude an agreement for joint struggle, and each time we have met with refusal. However, this does not confuse us. We shall make similar proposals to them again and again. If we conclude an agreement, we shall observe it. However, in actual practice we have often conducted ourselves as though we already had an agreement for joint struggle with the leading organs of the Social-Democratic parties, instead of saying the following to the Social-Democratic workers' and organizations: there is no choice, your leading bodies do not want a united action, you will have to begin yourselves. Instead of this, a number of our comrades began to invent things as follows: "and what if the Social Democratic leadership consider it disloyal action on our part? Won't they say that we are simply maneuvering and that our proposals are not sincere? And will they agree in the future to negotiate with us if today we appeal direct to their organizations?" As a result the following position has arisen: the leaders of the government Socialists knocked us over the head, and our people did not have the courage to tread on their corns out of the mistaken view that the united front will be set up more quickly by showing a spirit of accommodation. We are determinedly against beginning with abuse and quarreling. However, we cannot reply to the instant tactics of the leaders of the government Socialists against the united front with fight and expressions of regret, but must reply by fighting still more energetically for the establishment of the united front together with the Social Democratic workers' and organizations, and still more strongly organize joint action with them.

* * *

In concluding his report at the Seventh Congress, Comrade Dimitroff said:

"There are wiseacres who will sense in all this [in the new tactical line of the Comintern] a digression from our basic positions, some sort of turn to the Right of the straight line of Bolshevism. Well, in my country, Bulgaria, they say that a hungry chicken always dreams of millet. Let those political chickens think so.

"This interests us little. For us it is important that our own parties and the broad masses of the whole world should correctly understand what we are striving for."*

And if now, five months after the Seventh Congress, we examine how correctly the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia have been able to understand and apply the new line of the Seventh Congress, we are compelled to admit that in its first after easy, quick success, it has interpreted and applied this line incorrectly and in an opportunist fashion. Only during the last few weeks have there been certain improvements and a new, fighting spirit can be felt in the policy of the Party. However, the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will have to draw all the necessary conclusions from the preceding period of opportunist policy. Let the Party see wherein lie

* G. Dimitroff, *The United Front Against Fascism and War*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, p. 89.

the roots of the mistakes, so that it can in the future avoid any repetition of these mistakes.

* * *

Many Party members will very likely ask themselves the question: how could it happen that such gross distortions of the Party line made their appearance in the operation of the Party policy? There are many causes for this. However, the chief reason is that our Party lacked, and still lacks, *revolutionary vigilance*. There is an absence of revolutionary vigilance in relation to the Party line, the purity of Party policy, and also in relation to its attitude towards the people who have to operate the policy of the Party, namely *the Party cadres*. There is a lack of revolutionary vigilance both in the *Central Committee* and in the *local Party organizations*.

Opportunist mistakes do not manifest themselves immediately in such a way that a blind man can distinguish them. It is frequently difficult to recognize them in the beginning. Truly Bolshevik, revolutionary vigilance is required to do so. But with us, after all, it was not a question of newly manifested small slips, but of opportunist mistakes which were a mote in the eye of the Communist Party. Take, for instance, the disgraceful article in the *Rude Pravo* which we have cited, calling for increased armaments in Czechoslovakia, take the constant disgusting obsequiousness and compliments to Hampel, Necas and others, who are artificially decked out as Lefts, the voting for two articles in the Budget proposed by the government, and all the nonsense and blather about "mitigating the tensity of class relations", etc. Would the Party leadership have tolerated and abetted all this if it possessed revolutionary vigilance? Would it not, had such vigilance existed, have sounded the alarm in time, and seriously taken up the task of searching out the source of all this opportunist impurity? And if our organizations, our Party members were vigilant in a revolutionary fashion, could they have tolerated for so long these opportunist distortions of the line of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern on such important questions? Of course, any opportunist tendencies in the Party would have been strangled at birth if the leadership and the whole of the Party had displayed sufficient revolutionary vigilance. For in the main the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is healthy, relatively steeled, possesses big experiences of struggle against opportunism, and knows how to deal with opportunists. However, the indifferent attitude and inattention to individual unhealthy phenomena in the Party policy facilitated the parasitic growth of opportunism. We usually begin to shout when the house is already on fire. But when the sparks of the fire are only glowing, we do not notice them.

Revolutionary vigilance in respect to the Party policy must not be separated from revolutionary vigilance *in respect to Party forces*. The Party pursues its policy not by letting things take their own course. People operate this policy. How the policy is operated, where it leads the Party, all depends, in the long run, upon people, upon cadres. Let us call to mind the great words of Comrade Stalin: "Cadres decide

everything." Without doubt these words of Stalin have been repeated also in our Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. But it never entered our heads to draw the proper conclusions from them, to apply them to our own practical work. A type of an individual like Budin sat at the head of the editorial board of the central organ of our Party. He committed one outrage after another. People got angry with him, they argued with him, they reprimanded him, and yet he was left at the head of the editorial board. And he continued to carry on in the good old way. It was only when an intolerable stench arose, that the Party leadership took a closer interest in the work of Budin, and after a careful investigation became convinced that here was a case of downright wrecking by an individual who was alien and hostile to the Party. And only then was an end put to this business. But how much harm has this Budin caused the Party! And this is only one of the examples, a clear example, of the fact that in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia there was no vigilant attitude towards cadres, that the leadership tolerated the presence of incompetent, alien elements in responsible positions.

A policy of systematically educating cadres and adopting a solicitous attitude towards good and loyal Party forces has not been pursued and is still not pursued in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It was not for nothing that in his summing up the discussion on the report at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, Comrade Dimitroff devoted so much space to the question of cadres. Comrade Dimitroff pointed out that a correct policy as regards Party cadres should answer the following conditions: first, it is essential to *know people*. Second, we must know how to *select and advance cadres correctly*. Third, we must make *skillful use of cadres*. Fourth, the *cadres must be correctly placed*. Fifth, systematic assistance must be given to cadres. Sixth, *care must be taken to preserve cadres*.

Comrade Dimitroff also gave detailed suggestions as to which cadres should be trained by the Party, what the Party should take account of in selecting cadres, and what qualities should be made use of and developed in cadres.

First, *profound devotion to the cause of the working class, loyalty to the Party, tested in battles, in face of the class enemy*. Second, *the closest links with the masses*. Third, *the ability to find ones bearings independently in any situation and not to be afraid of assuming responsibility for making decisions*. Fourth, *a sense of discipline and Bolshevik staunchness*, both in the struggle against the class enemy and in the adoption of an irreconcilable attitude towards all deviations from the line of Bolshevism.

Golden words, golden rules! But it appears that in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia they were not read with sufficient attention, and what is quite certain, they were still less applied. This is why such people as Budin could hold such responsible positions. We have no people available for promotion, some comrades frequently complain. That is not true! Can it be that there are no such people in a proletarian party comprising scores of thousands of loyal, self-sacrificing

working class functionaries? Let us rather admit that we have not tried to find these people, to get to know them, to educate them, to promote them, to help them, we have not cared about them, we have not tried to help them grow. Let us rather admit that it is precisely because we allowed all those Budins to be around that there was not enough room and air for proletarian, truly revolutionary, cadres to grow. We must admit that if we had pursued a good Bolshevik policy concerning cadres we would have been able to avoid many opportunist mistakes in the policy of the Party.

• • •

Without doubt the opportunist mistakes of the last few months have considerably colored the atmosphere around the Party and within the Party itself. And this no doubt assisted the acts of provocation of the class enemies who have tried, and are trying now, and will continue to try, to besmirch the revolutionary prestige of the Party and discredit it in the eyes of the masses. However, the class enemy is miscalculating.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, led by the Comintern and its helmsman, Comrade Dimitroff, will lay bare its mistakes, correct them, and strike dumb all those who want to make use of these mistakes for their own filthy ends. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will correct its line in the spirit of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and hurl itself into the struggle with open visor and renewed enthusiasm to establish united action among the working class in Czechoslovakia.

If we now criticize our mistakes and show the entire working class where the Party took a false step, we do so in the interests of the victory of this struggle, in the interests of the cause of the entire working class. He who works, he who fights, makes mistakes. He who serves the bourgeoisie follows a simple course, namely, he serves the bourgeoisie to self-oblivion. Every worker, the Party, and the class as a whole learn from mistakes made. But we must recognize our mistakes, understand their causes and draw conclusions for the future, so as to avoid repeating the same mistake.

The Party corrects its line *as it marches in the course of the struggle*. Herein lies the *real* correction of mistakes made. The need for mustering all proletarian, truly anti-fascist forces for the joint struggle is dictated by the following facts:

Pellagra in the Sudetta; 800,000 unemployed; the poverty-stricken position of the workers in factories; want and need among the peasantry and handicraft workers; a new drive by fascist reaction; further capitulation by the government Socialists, in the face of reaction. We shall get rid of everything that is wrong in our tactics, everything that hinders the rallying together of the anti-fascist, anti-capitalist fighting front. Inside the Party and out, a fresh wind is already blowing. That is a good thing. Many, very many good comrades in the Party and outside are heaving a sigh of relief. And the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will now take place in the spirit of Dimitroff.

The Congress of the Communist Party of France

By MAURICE THOREZ

COMRADE DIMITROFF, in his speech at the close of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, declared:

"Our Congress has set before the international proletariat as its most important immediate task that of consolidating its forces politically and organizationally, of putting an end to the isolation to which it had been reduced by the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, of rallying the toilers around the working class in a wide people's front against the offensive of capital and reaction against fascism and the threat of war in each individual country and in the international arena." *

Comrade Dimitroff further stated that:

"We have not invented this task. It has been prompted by the experience of the world labor movement itself, above all the experience of the proletariat of France." **

Thanks to the initiative of the Communist Party, the people's front has really been set going in France in conditions of growing resistance by the toiling masses to the attacks made by reaction and fascism. The basic causes which have impelled the bourgeoisie of a number of countries to resort to bloody methods of fascist dictatorship operate in France as well. Just as in Germany and the other fascist countries, so in France also the imperialists would like to make use of fascism as a means of throwing the whole burden of the economic crisis upon the toilers, of forestalling the growing forces of revolution, and ensuring the preparation and conduct of an imperialist war.

The French fascists for the first time tried to make a big sally on the evening of February 6, 1934. But the toilers of France, learning from the bitter experience of the German developments, and warned in time by the Communist Party—the only party which called upon them to demonstrate on February 9, 1934—successfully repulsed the sally of the fascist leagues. This demonstration and the response which it met among the broad masses determined the political character and fighting spirit of the general strike of February 12—which was a big success for the anti-fascist movement.

However, ever since then, side by side with the increasing activity of the masses, there has been a constant increase in the menace from the direction of the most violent enemies of the people. The economic and social causes which have favored this are obvious. Toward the end of 1935, France was the only one of all the big capitalist countries

* *The Communist International*, No. 17-18, 1935, p. 1160.
** *Ibid.*

where the economic crisis continued to deepen. The index of industrial production fell to the lowest point since the beginning of the world crisis. Unemployment was increasing. The emergency decrees worsened the conditions of the toiling masses. The wages and pensions of the small clerks, retired civil servants, and ex-servicemen, which had already been subjected to considerable reduction on more than one occasion, were now reduced by an additional 10 per cent. In this connection, with this further reduction in the purchasing power of the masses, we are witnessing a still further decline in production, a slowing down of the commodities turnover, and a decline in budget receipts. Ten billion francs have been "saved" at the expense of the poorest sections of the population, yet the budget deficit has not been reduced. According to preliminary estimates, the deficit will reach six billion francs next year, exclusive of the four billion arrears in respect of revenue from the railways.

The financial situation is not only not improving but, on the contrary, is becoming more difficult. In 1935, the total debts amounted to 20 billion francs. The state coffers are empty. The withdrawals from the savings banks far exceed the new deposits. There is a colossal flow of gold out of the country, not only in consequence of the deficit in the balance of trade and payments, but also in consequence of speculation and the export of capital. The franc is menaced, and the depreciation of the franc is coming nearer and nearer. It is the toilers who will have to pay for the depreciation of the franc, just as they are today paying for the policy of deflation.

The toilers are protesting against the emergency decrees, and are resisting wage reductions. The workers have conducted several successful strikes (Saint Chamont, Rouen, Marseilles). The clerks and railway men have carried through demonstrations of protest on more than one occasion. The ex-servicemen arrange processions in Paris to the grave of the Unknown Soldier, demanding that their rights be respected and that their pensions remain untouched. All this is inspiring the bourgeoisie to intensify the line aimed at setting up a fascist dictatorship, so as to break down the resistance of the masses to the capitalist offensive. Speculating on the growing needs of the masses, the French mimics of Hitler and Mussolini are launching a broad campaign of social demagogery.

In the French villages the government policy of national unity is causing ever growing discontent. The price of wheat remains at the same level, although bread is dearer. In spite of all official promises, the prices of agricultural products have not been raised to correspond to the increase in the prices of the commodities which the peasants require. It is on these grounds that the fascist agitator, Dorgeres, is trying to rally the ruined peasant masses.

The international situation, which is extremely tense in connection with the attack upon Ethiopia by Italian fascism, has given the reactionary press and the fascist leagues an excuse for launching a monstrous campaign. The French people are confirming their sincere desire for peace, and are indignant at the criminal adventure being pursued by

Mussolini. But at the same time, the mimics and agents of Mussolini in France endorse his policy in every possible way. Colonel de la Rocque and his supporters uphold the dual policy of Laval who signed the Pact of Rome and the plan to partition Ethiopia. They insist upon France pursuing a policy of friendship with the government of Rome, *i.e.*, adopting a position hostile towards the League of Nations and refusing to resort to sanctions.

The chauvinist leaders of the leagues, arrant supporters of war, are demagogically howling: "Long live peace," "Down with war." They accuse the real friends of peace—the revolutionary workers, the democratically-inclined peasants and all the real supporters of the republic—of wanting to start war. At the same time, the true friends of Laval are renewing their attacks against the U.S.S.R., against the mutual assistance pact, which the French people in May, 1935, demanded should be signed. Supported by the renegade Doriot, these chauvinist leaders are insisting upon the conclusion of an alliance with Hitler, and are encouraging Laval's maneuvers in this direction.

The fascist danger in France exists as hitherto. The fascists are reorganizing their ranks and revising their methods in order once more to take up the offensive when the requisite situation arises. But the resistance of the masses is also growing. The widest scale on which the forces of the masses have been and are being consolidated is on the basis of the defense of democratic rights and republican liberties gained by the toiling masses as a result of long years of heroic struggle. Democratic traditions are deep-rooted among the masses of workers and peasants in France, and are the consequence of many revolutions and rebellions carried through on behalf of freedom. They are traditions inherited from their great forefathers of 1793, which, at the end of last century, during the Dreyfus case, determined the mighty movement in defense of the republic against the onslaught of reaction. And it is these same traditions which have endowed with such tremendous scope the people's front in defense of peace and freedom, and in defense of the republic, which arose at the initiative of the Communist Party.

* * *

The Communist Party of France has been carrying on activities on a wide scale, which have borne fruit. At our Party Conference in June, 1934, we pointed out that:

"To bar the way of fascism, united action between the Communist and Socialist workers must be set up, and trade union unity be restored, *at all costs*. An alliance between the working class and the toilers of the middle section of society must also be set up."

By acting in concert and determinedly, and ridding itself of the Barbe-Selor sectarian grouping, and of the renegade liquidator and splitter, Doriot, our Party has successfully fulfilled the task set by the Congress. The united front set up among the rank and file during the process of the struggle, shoulder to shoulder, of workers of all currents,

against the armed bands of big capital, against the employers or against the pro-fascist reactionary governments, ended in the agreement for common action concluded between the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in July, 1934. The merger of the trade unions, which was considerably facilitated by the successful preparatory work carried out by the unitarian trade unions, is already being achieved in the localities, in trade union branches, in the inter-union county organizations and in the industrial federations. The Railwaymen's Federation, which has already been united, has about 150,000 members. We have an indication of the democratic moods of the workers in the election of our comrades Midol and Seward to the leadership, although our opponents, former members of the General Confederation of Labor, opposed their election on the alleged grounds of the principle of the incompatibility of holding trade union offices along with membership in parliament or in municipal councils.

The People's Front has arisen in spite of the resistance of open and secret enemies. Thanks to the People's Front, the results which we reckoned upon have now been achieved: a mighty barrier has been thrown up against the development of fascism. The broad scope of the anti-fascist movement of the people has forced the bourgeoisie to change its tactics and to try to present to the masses in some other way the character of their shock detachments.

Never before in the course of the entire history of the Third Republic has there been such a clearly expressed move to the Left on the part of the masses of the people as we have had since February, 1934. This process is still continuing. After the victories of the People's Front, and of the Communist Party which inspired it, in the municipal elections in May, 1935, and later in the District Council elections in the suburbs of Paris in June, 1935, further new successes were achieved both in the provinces and in Paris. In Maine et Loire, an agricultural region, with age-long conservative traditions, and in the other agrarian region, Oise, the candidates of the People's Front, thanks to the energetic support of the Communists, were successful in obtaining two mandates which had hitherto invariably gone to former marquises. In Paris, three Communists elected to the municipalities—Laval declared these elections invalid—were again elected in the first ballot. And in election district No. 4 the Communist candidate, who was unsuccessful in May of last year, this time gained a victory over a reactionary, obtaining a majority of 800 votes.

It is clear that the masses of the people in France are swinging to the Left. And it is precisely with a view to checking this swing to the Left that Laval and the reactionary politicians who support him, have tried to carry out the carefully elaborated maneuver of "national conciliation", which was successful, and yet not successful; it was successful in the sense that Laval is still in power, but it was unsuccessful in the sense that the Chamber of Deputies converted the slogans of the fascist leagues into a snare for the latter themselves, and under the influence of a small group of Communists voted for legislation demanding the immediate disarmament and dissolution of armed bands. So

great was the success achieved by the People's Front by force of the pressure it exerted. However, only the vigilance, courage, solidarity, organized strength and activity of the rank and file of the people can guarantee victory for the anti-fascists.

For, despite all these obvious successes, we must not close our eyes to the regrouping and consolidation of the forces of reaction, as well as to the difficulties, to the weak features which are apparent in the People's Front itself, and to the fact that it is carrying on insufficient activity. It was the simplest thing, one which met with the greatest success, to mobilize the masses of the people for the struggle for freedom against the fascist leagues menacing democratic liberties. Without ignoring other forms of the onslaught of big capital, and considering joint action to be necessary in the economic sphere as well, our Party believed that special difficulties in launching this struggle should not lead to the breakdown of the agreement, even though it was restricted merely to the defense of democratic liberties and peace. For instance, the Communist Party has always fought and still fights against the policy of emergency decrees pursued by the notorious government of national unity. The Communist Party shows how harmful this policy is for the toiling masses, and how such a policy is totally unable to solve the economic crisis, which is undermining the economic life of France. The Socialist Party is also against the emergency decrees. But despite the signing of the agreement which provides for active struggle against the emergency decrees, they have always refused actually to mobilize the masses for the struggle, to the point of giving support to the strikes prepared and launched by the trade unions against the robbery of clerks, workers, and civil servants and municipal employees.

Although there was strong opposition in the Radical Party, the latter recognized the emergency decrees in principle. However, under the pressure of the masses, it has demanded that the decrees be made more "humane", where they were directed against the clerks and war invalids. Thus, on the question of the emergency decrees, there is no agreement between the three largest parties in the People's Front. And this, of course, weakens the force of the drive of the broad masses of the people. This being so, our Party has adopted the attitude that each party of the People's Front maintains its freedom to develop its own activity in such a way as not to cause losses or bring harm to joint action in the sphere of the anti-fascist struggle.

If we pass on further to an examination of economic problems, and the solutions offered by the different participants in the People's Front, we shall see that the differences existing between them are still greater.

The Communist Party has constantly insisted upon the introduction of an emergency progressive income tax upon large fortunes so that, by solving the financial difficulties in this way, the position of the toiling masses will be lightened. We have formulated our program of immediate demands in the sphere of finance in the slogan, "Let the rich pay". The Socialist Party is not in agreement with this. It talks about "structural reform", about "nationalization". And we in reply

declare that the Communists support, and fight for, proletarian nationalization, but consider that the working class must first win power as a result of a victorious revolution and the establishment of the French Soviet Republic, in order to apply this measure. Today, it is a question not of the program of proletarian revolution, but of the daily, urgent demands which today can mobilize the broad masses for the struggle against the offensive of capital and fascism, for shifting part of the burden which at present is oppressing the most destitute sections of the people onto the shoulders of the rich.

The Radical Party also does not consider acceptable our slogan of an emergency progressive income tax upon the capitalists, although this demand has long figured in its program. The majority of the Radical group has supported the financial policy of the national unity cabinets.

And here it is clear that in searching for an essential and possible agreement for the immediate mobilization of the masses on the basis of the most urgent and moderate economic demands, each party should at the same time fight for its own program. Our program is the program of the proletariat, its revolutionary vanguard. It is the program of struggle for Soviet Power, for real socialization, for the development of the broadest democracy. *But at the same time the struggle for the future of the working class and of the whole of the French people does not exclude, but on the contrary demands, that the most elementary interests and needs of the toiling masses be defended right now, today.* On this basis we can and must come together, and come to an agreement with those who, although they do not share our views as to final aims and means of struggle, nevertheless agree to wage a joint struggle for immediate demands.

And, finally, the Communist Party of France, on the basis of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, has declared itself prepared, in conditions where the anti-fascist movement develops energetically and on a broad scale, to support, if need be, and even to take part in, a government of the People's Front. It is clear that on this question the opinions of the different participants in the People's Front are at very great variance. For us, Communists, it is a question of the possibility of a government coming into being in circumstances of political crisis, a government relying mainly upon the activity of the masses outside parliament, on the forces of the working class united in a single General Confederation of Labor; it would be such a government as would really proceed to disarm and dissolve the fascist leagues, place their leaders behind prison bars, and suspend their newspapers; a government which would force the rich to pay, which would destroy the monopoly of the banks, and officially abolish the Council of Regents of the state bank of France, etc. But such a government can on no account be simply a parliamentary combination, something in the nature of an extended second edition of a so-called "Left bloc government". It would be a government leading the masses to the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the Soviet Republic.

The Communist Party of France considers it essential to set up

rank-and-file committees of the People's Front, to establish a widespread firm organization of the people's anti-fascist movement which opens up wide vistas for the broadest initiative of the masses, since such rank-and-file committees of the people's anti-fascist movement are a guarantee that the movement will be successful, a guarantee against a new drive of the fascists.

The Socialist Party and, of course, the Radical Party are not of our opinion, do not share our line. The Socialist Party understands the united front government to mean participation in bourgeois governments, as has been and now continues to be the practice of Social-Democracy in many countries. The Radical Party strictly adheres to parliamentary formulas. It would therefore be useless to attempt at this time to thrust a general program on the question of the government upon parties which pursue such different ends. Thus, we return to the crux of the question: the People's Front in the present conditions will fully achieve its aim if it bases itself upon rank-and-file committees of the masses, if it bars the way to fascism, if it makes it possible for bourgeois democracy to function normally, and allows the working class to continue the daily struggle for a better existence and to rally its forces in preparation for the struggle for its final emancipation.

The Communist Party is endeavoring first and foremost to formulate such slogans and elaborate such decisions as would help the further growth of the working class movement and the entire People's Front.

Our campaign under the slogan, "Let the rich pay", has met with a very wide response. The bourgeois press has commented upon our proposals in every possible way. The daily organ of the industrialists took issue with us in articles bearing the signatures of its editor-in-chief, an authoritative economist.

Our Party did not limit itself to general solutions of the question. In appealing to the peasantry our Party formulated its "*program to save French agriculture*".

This program provides for the direct demands of the toiling peasantry, as well as for measures against the trusts, the big middlemen and the agrarians, with a view to restoring the prices of agricultural products without increasing prices for the consumer. The program demands the payment of crisis benefits, of seed subsidies and selection of seeds, and the distribution of fertilizers; it indicates how to raise the funds for this purpose.

Our Party is trying to give an answer to every vital question. It is expressing its opinion on all the problems facing the working class movement and the entire French people. It is displaying tremendous initiative and at the same time the maximum determination and firmness.

Many of our prominent opponents have more than once emphasized the merits of our Party, which has successfully linked up its policy with the revolutionary Jacobin traditions of the French people. One of them wrote: "We must take our hats off to the Party which has been able to inspire the singing of the 'Marseillaise' with the 'International'." Our Party has taken away from the reactionaries and fascists the hymn of the revolutionaries of 1793 and 1848.

The Party is proceeding further along this road. Considering ourselves to be the true defenders of the interests of the working class and the French people, and the sole representatives of their future, we have particularly taken up the action of those problems which are attracting the attention of the whole country. We have shown that the policy of the bourgeoisie is also today every aspect of life is pushing France along the convulsive path. We have raised the question of the protection of workers and children of the protection of the family. The low birth rate which is the result of capitalist exploitation is by law's side one of the factors the future of the French people. The older type in France more decidedly approves the low rate. We have studied the effects of this policy. We have shown the social economic and social results for the low birth rate.

Overemployment, poverty, uncertainty of the future, the fear of war—these are the causes which are leading to a reduction in the birth rate. Farmers and workers are forced to leave millions from the world, who would be destined to be a life of misery and death to all who at least could not yet find a more lucrative occupation. We have demanded that it shall thus not be protection. Big farm as must be guaranteed work and a good wage. Working class families must be afforded protection. And in the days of the peasant it is that there must be an end to the less status and all that the peasant alone requires material. This is in strengthen of the old age home to which they must be given conditions and enough money so as to accumulate that will give food to school, to the home. The wife of the old, the helpless children must be given an opportunity of continuing their studies, and they must be given work to correspond with that as well as of finishing the higher schools.

The Communist Party has taken up questions of sport. It has noticed the fact that French sportsmen are constantly being defeated in different forms of sport and said that first class sportsmen, as the French runner Larcher, etc., are prevented from going to the U.S. forced to earn their living competing in the U.S. and elsewhere. This is the result of the greed of capital which uses only after goods which sees in all that festering of human activity only a means of making profit, and which for the sake of profits sacrifices the interests of the sports movement and the whole of the nation.

Similarly the Communist Party is exposing the decline of literature and art. The growth of crime and prostitution is seen as the horrors of the present order, of which Marx wrote that "the accumulation of riches at the same time gives the accumulation of poverty, misery, slavery, ignorance, as well as moral degradation." In other words the Party emerges as enemies of the corruption and corruption of the ruling classes. The last few years in France are no exception for the big financial scandals that have occurred. The whole world of political humbugs, diplomats and ministers of state, of the army and higher officials, retired generals, prefects and ambassadors, is bespattered with blood and sin. Robbers of the treasury, or to a lesser of official positions are at present all to broad day light. Such scoundrels have become

the favorite theme for the demagogic utterances of fascist leaders, who try to make use of the just fury and indignation of the masses in connection with these affairs, in the interests of capital. On February 6, the fascists made their preparations under the slogan: "Down with the robbers and their accomplices—parliament."

The Communist Party has declared for all to hear that it would work to obtain the real "reconciliation of the French nation", the real unity of the forces of the French people for the struggle against the insignificant capitalist minority which exploits the masses of the people, forcing them to starvation and ruin. The Communist Party has shown that those who engender strife among the people must be sought for among "the two hundred families who hold the entire economic life and politics of the country in their hands", and that it is the financial oligarchy which organizes and arms the fascist bands. We have determinedly torn away the masks from the faces of the sham patriots who lead the storm detachments and deceive the French people. We have unmasked them to the end in connection with their campaign in favor of Italian imperialism. In this particular case they acted as agents of the foreign fascist governments in Berlin and Rome, as the hired emigrants of Hitler and Mussolini, as the worthy offspring of their fathers who served in the army of the Prussian King and the Coblenz emigrants.

Finally, in the face of the menace of a violent fascist *coup d'état*, the Communist Party, struggling against the fascization of the army, puts forward as its own the appeal of the People's Front to the republican army. This manifesto emphasizes the fact that we have faith in the democratic outlook of the French soldiers—the sons of the people, and the republican officers; we believe that, when need arises, they will reveal and undermine the plans of the royalist and fascist officers, and that they will successfully frustrate the fascist plot that is being laid against the republic.

All our most essential arguments in favor of uniting the French people for the struggle against their enemies were included in the excellent letter written by Marcel Cachin to the national volunteers, to the active members of the Croix de Feu organization, which is the chief instigator of civil war, the hired vassal of capital.

This new document issued by the Central Committee of our Party has created a big impression. It has already been distributed in 200,000 copies. Another edition is being asked for. Our leaflets on the same subject have enjoyed the same success. They were all sold out to organizations and active members of the rank-and-file units of the Communist Party and sympathizers.

The Communist Party of France is doing its utmost by its activity to remain worthy of the praise with which Comrade Dimitroff spoke of it at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

The Communist Party is uninterruptedly strengthening its ranks. The influence and authority of the Party are growing. Every word of the Communist Party meets with the widest response not only among its friends and allies but also among enemies and opponents. The Party

is growing numerically as well: by the end of 1935 it had over 70,000 members. And only two years ago there were less than 30,000 members in the Party.

The daily circulation of *l'Humanite* is 250,000, and on Sundays—350,000.

The Young Communist League now has about 30,000 members; its weekly organ *l'Avantgarde*, has a circulation of 40,000.

The report of the Organizational Department of the Party, drawn up for presentation to the Congress, is a thick pamphlet of 140 pages. Every chapter of the report is peppered with figures and data testifying to the successes of the Party in all spheres of its work.

Of course, we are not blinded by our successes. We know that the menace of the offensive of the fascists has only temporarily been frustrated, and that the enemy is not crushed. We recognize the weaknesses and defects of the anti-fascist People's Front. It is with the greatest alarm that we note the absence of that which could be the guarantee of the complete, decisive and lasting success of the anti-fascist people's movement, namely, a thick network of rank-and-file mass bodies of the People's Front.

The task of setting up such bodies, such committees, still remains most acute. It would be wise to focus the maximum efforts of all sincere and determined supporters of the People's Front, and first and foremost the efforts of the Communists, on getting such organizations set up. We must soberly evaluate the political importance of the inconsistency, indecisiveness, vacillations of our allies in the People's Front. Behavior of this kind on the part of our allies causes no little difficulties, and covers up not a few dangers in the way of consolidating the anti-fascist forces.

Neither must we close our eyes to the weaknesses and defects of our own Party and the dangers which menace it. In launching out upon the intensive, broad political activities that have been conducted by our Party during recent years, and with the rapid influx of new members, the danger arises of Right opportunist mistakes and deviations. Therefore, the Central Committee of the Party (and even more so the coming Party Congress) is confronted with the necessity of keeping a vigilant watch to ensure that the line of the Party is carried out correctly and on the basis of principle, and that there is a steady rise in the ideological and political level of the Party members. The Central Committee of the Party has therefore decided to place in the center of the work of the Congress the organizational tasks of the Party and especially of the question of new Party forces. For, despite the fact that we have had considerable achievements, we are still terribly backward in the carrying out of our organizational tasks. The political influence of the Party has advanced rapidly, it has grown in extent; broad sections of the proletariat and toilers follow our Party. Our leading Party workers have grown quantitatively and qualitatively, but they are far from being adequate. Now we have to multiply our cadres many times, and they must be far more experienced, better trained, better able to find their bearings independently and rapidly, to work on new lines, to widen

and consolidate the links between the Party and the masses, and to lead all forms of the struggle of the masses on behalf of their demands.

In spite, however, of the shortcomings and weaknesses in our Party, it is a splendid, healthy organism. United and monolithic, it has rallied firmly around its Central Committee. All the work of the Party is carried out in a spirit of confidence and absolute loyalty and faith towards the Communist International, its Bolshevik general staff, and our great leader, Comrade Stalin.

A discussion has opened on the question included in the agenda of the Eighth Congress of the Party which will take place January 22-25, The agenda of the forthcoming congress is as follows: 1. Report of the Central Committee on political and organizational questions (Marcel Cachin). 2. The Communist Party in the People's Front for work, freedom and peace (Maurice Thorez). 3. The question of saving French agriculture (Renaud Jean). 4. The future of the French youth (Jacques Duclos). 5. Election of leading bodies.

Meetings of nuclei and conferences of district committees are now being held. Regional conferences were to be held between December 15 and January 12. All the meetings and conference that have been held to date have unanimously, without any reservations, and with enthusiasm, approved the line pursued by the C.C. of the C.P. of France, aided by the Comintern. In the course of its mass work, the Party has learned to fight on two fronts: against opportunist and liquidating deviations, and against sectarianism. The Party is extending its fighting experience to the whole of the working class movement, and especially in the sense of fighting against the demoralizing influence of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. The Communist Party is conducting a struggle to establish a united party of the working class. Seven months ago we drew up a charter of working class unity. We formulated our draft, taking account of the experience of the international working class movement for the last 20 years, the experiences of the victory of the toilers in the U.S.S.R. under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, and the bitter experiences of the toilers of Germany and Austria who, in the main, have remained under the influence of the parties of the Second International.

We are inspired by the principles of Lenin and Stalin, which were so brilliantly developed in the reports and speeches of Comrades Dimitroff and Manuilsky at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

We hope that by following this road we shall achieve triumph for the People's Front for work, freedom and peace in France, and later the victory of Soviet Power, and the establishment of a French Soviet Republic.

Social Credit and the Experiences of the Canadian Communists

By JOHN PORTER

SOME months ago the first Social Credit government ever to obtain office was elected in the agricultural-industrial province of Alberta, Canada. Out of 63 seats in the provincial legislature, 56 are held by Social Credit members, under the leadership of Premier William Aberhart. The Liberals and Conservatives were utterly routed. The Labor Party lost all seats held in the previous House. The Communist Party, while increasing its vote, failed to elect any candidates. This new government at once became a center of attraction for the press in the United States, in England, Canada and other English-speaking countries. The Aberhart victory re-awakened interest in the Social Credit movement in Australia and New Zealand. In the U.S.A., such movements as that of the Townsend organizations saw in the Alberta victory a stimulus for their own similar creeds of "social and economic justice", and Father Coughlin, in an interview with Aberhart, declared that Social Credit has his support.

Aberhart declares that Social Credit, promising \$25 a month to every adult citizen, is an alternative to revolution. He does not propose to do away with private property but at the same time promises the distribution of the surplus products which modern capitalism is able to produce but which the consumers are unable to purchase. This distribution would be made possible by means of social credit, payable by the government in the form of the "basic dividend", which would be financed by a tax on the turnover of commodities, which in turn would be sold at a price fixed by the state.

But, will not the government shift the burden onto the shoulders of the consumers through the raising of prices? Aberhart declares that this will not be so since the government will fix prices.

Aberhart opposed his plan of Social Credit and of class collaboration to the class struggle.

"Communism believes in the wage system. Social Credit believes in the dividend system."

"Communism regards the economic problem as one of production, Social Credit as one of distribution."

"Communism believes in the class struggle. Social Credit makes possible the brotherhood of man."

"Communism believes in physical revolution. Social Credit believes in mental revolution."

"Communism believes in the dictatorship of the proletariat. Social Credit believes in economic democracy."

His attitude to capitalist private property is made clear in the following revealing sentence, contained in his *Social Credit Manual*: "It is not the intention of Social Credit to confiscate or take anything

away from those that already have it." Without confiscating anything from anybody, either from the capitalist, the banker, or the landlord, Aberhart promises to establish a "leisure state".

Here it is of importance to note the influence of Social Credit ideas within the labor movement not only in Canada but in almost all the English-speaking countries.

The Social Credit movement, as is known, originated in England, in the writings of Major Douglas, an Australian engineer who refers to himself as an "engineer in the realm of economics". His theories, he claims, originated at a time when, as a government representative during the war, he was visiting factories that were producing munitions under government control. It was then that he began to see that engineering when applied to economics gives much more practical results for mankind than can be supplied by the economists themselves. Douglas has also testified before the MacMillan Commission as an expert on banking in England, and has advanced a Social Credit scheme for the "reorganization" of Scotland, which involved cutting the wages of the workers and attacking the trade unions. In Great Britain they have created the Greenshirt movement. In the recent General Election in Britain, one Social Credit candidate was nominated in Leeds, receiving almost 4,000.

In Britain, the National Credit program of the Labor Party approaches the credit fallacies advanced by Major Douglas despite a certain amount of criticism of the more obvious fallacies. Thus, the idea is advanced that through state control of credit and finances "socialism" can be established and the old Laborite slogans on "nationalization of industry" are being shoved to the background.

Sir Oswald Mosley, now head of the British Union of Fascists, has recently declared that fascism supports Social Credit.

In Australia and New Zealand, Social Credit ideas have been broadcast for many years, and the recently elected New Zealand Labor government was voted into office on a program in which Social Credit "theories" and proposals play a leading role.

The influence of Social Credit upon some of the trade union and Labor Party leaders in Britain is well known. In Canada, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (the Farmer-Labor Party) leaders have for years either openly advocated or toyed with Social Credit ideas, and have actually in the past advanced proposals in the House of Commons which were on definite Social Credit lines. It is particularly noteworthy that the Labor members of Parliament from the Province of Alberta, who have now all been defeated by Social Credit candidates, had been the most ardent Social Credit supporters in the past, and were instrumental in securing the "expert" advice of Major Douglas for banking commissions.

Whom do they appeal to, these apostles of "Social Credit" or of similar movements, who promise by means of "social dividends" or by "sharing the wealth" to save the masses from impoverishment, unemployment and misery, while continuing monopolist capitalism and exploitation?

In the first place, Social Credit draws its adherents from the oppressed and harassed middle classes of the towns, who are face to face with extinction, or who have been already ruined by monopoly capitalism. To them Social Credit, with its "destruction" of the power of the banks, appears as a savior. At the same time, Social Credit assures them of a "peaceful" transition to a "new order" of "economic democracy", without the ordeal of revolution.

But its influence does not stop here. It has, in Alberta and Australia (and in the form of the Long, Townsend and Coughlin movements, in the U.S.A.) rallied many thousands of poor farmers, who see their enemy in the banks, who are looking for relief, who are demanding "fair" prices for their products which would cover the cost of production and guarantee them a living, who are seeking cheap credit to continue producing. These farming masses, disappointed by the lies of the old parties and receiving no leadership from the working class, become an easy prey of the "Social Credit" demagogues. Thus, for example, Aberhart in Alberta won the support of the wheat farmers by his slogan "a fair price for farm products". It would also be a fatal mistake to underestimate its influence amongst some sections of the industrial workers. How else was it possible for Aberhart to receive the votes of Alberta miners and railroaders, or for the Social Credit candidates in Leeds to receive 4,000 votes, if not by means of the most brazen demagogery as was the promise to pay to each adult citizen the sum of \$25 monthly as his share of the "basic dividend"?

Thus, such movements as "Social Credit", appealing to the needs of the masses, utilizing their disappointment with the old parties, keep them from going over to the revolutionary movement. This gulling of the masses is being carried on in the interests of the big bourgeoisie with the most blatant social and national demagogery, "national" because, as in Alberta, Social Credit advances the idea of self-contained economic districts; "social" because of its anti-monopoly-capitalism phrases.

True, as yet the organs of big capital, the main newspapers, speakers, etc., are openly criticizing the Social Credit movement and its arguments. But, after the election of Aberhart and when the big bourgeoisie of Canada saw in this movement something which, while not challenging capitalist rule, has gained that support among the broad masses which the older capitalist parties are in the process of losing, their tone of criticism became one of "wait and see". Aberhart himself, as soon as his election became known, and when investors began to withdraw their deposits from the Province, hastened to reassure them that not a penny of their capital was in danger.

To the extent that the leaders of this movement begin to feel their influence and power, they direct it against the revolutionary workers, with the purpose of destroying the trade unions, free speech, free press, etc. Major Douglas, Social Credit's leader, says this quite frankly. Here are a number of statements he has made which reveal the class essence of his "theories". He advised the bourgeoisie of Canada on his trip to that country last year "to unite all the capital parties into one and form a national government". His Scottish proposals contained the proviso that in order to establish and accumulate "basic dividends" all

wages must be cut immediately by 25 per cent. In Canada, Douglas declared: "For the benefit of Social Credit it would be necessary to have monopoly rights on the radio and press". Aberhart has declared that strikes are "suicidal" and that trade unions are unnecessary under the Social Credit system as they introduce an un-Social Credit pressure on "income".

There is a striking similarity between the phrases and methods of organization of the Social Credit leaders at the present time and the Nazis in the early days of their movement. The Aberhart movement is built on the principle of unquestioned obedience to the "leader", Aberhart, without any inner democracy. Naive belief in "Social Credit" is the only "principle" one has to possess in order to be a member. Reasoning is at a discount as far as the "Social Credit" leaders are concerned.

It is necessary that the Communists in all countries where Social Credit and similar movements exist pay a great deal of attention to them as movements containing many thousands of honest opponents of capitalist oppression, who are being fooled and deceived by skilled demagogues in the interests of capitalism.

In this connection it will be valuable to analyze the methods by means of which Aberhart was elected and the experiences of the Canadian Communists in the fight against Social Credit demagogery, and the mistakes that they committed. This will be of interest to other parties, particularly those in the English-speaking countries.

• • •

How did it come about that the Social Credit Party, which is little more than a year old, succeeded in Alberta in defeating all other parties in such an overwhelming fashion? In the answer to this question we must consider in the first place that the United Farmers of Alberta (a reformist farmers' organization) had controlled the provincial government for 14 years, since 1921. It was elected by the farmers of this province, hoping to relieve their economic and social needs. The U.F.A. leaders, far from carrying out the responsibilities placed on them by their followers, instead carried through policies of reaction in the interests of the rich farmers, the big grain interests and the industrial bourgeoisie. For example, the U.F.A. government refused to ease the pressing burdens of the farmers by forbidding evictions and reducing debts. On the contrary, the U.F.A. government was the custodian of all the interests of the ruling class. As far as the workers are concerned, the U.F.A. government participated fully in the terror directed against the labor organizations, and with the utmost violence stamped upon strikes, unemployed demonstrations, hunger marches and all other evidences of working class militancy. Last year the U.F.A. government passed the reactionary Trades and Industry Act, in the interests of big capital. This act provides compulsory codes for workers, places still great penalties on strikes, and turns the unions into state appendages.

The U.F.A. government dabbled in social credit fantasies, and only recently hired Major Douglas, the Social Credit theorist, to give "expert" advice on the finances of the province.

In short, for a period of 14 years the U.F.A. government carried out the policies of the big bourgeoisie and the rich agrarians. It thereby lost all the confidence of the masses of the workers and farmers, whose economic and social lot in the period of the crisis has become increasingly hard.

In his situation, the Social Credit Party appeared a little more than a year ago, led by William Aberhart. Expounding the theories of Major Douglas, the Social Credit leaders embarked on a demagogic program of promises calculated to exploit the increasing despair of the toilers who had become thoroughly disillusioned with the reactionary politics of the U.F.A. government. The Social Credit Party unfolded a mass agitation under the main slogan: "*Abolish Poverty in Alberta*". This slogan was concretized in the form of guaranteeing \$25 monthly to each adult citizen, which sum (in the form of non-negotiable certificates) would be drawn from the "basic dividend". The methods by which this amount of goods would be forthcoming under the existing capitalist relations with production being carried on for profit have never been fully explained by the Social Credit leaders. All challenges to do so are met with a stock answer: "If you understand Social Credit, it is clear. If you do not, then you are an opponent and we will not be drawn into arguments".

The Social Credit leaders instructed their followers to refuse to enter into debates with opponents. The agitation and propaganda of Aberhart and his lieutenants have been conducted most skillfully. Rejecting all discussion, they resort to the most evangelical methods of inflaming the toilers and exploiting in the most vile manner their hatred of big capital.

The people of Alberta undoubtedly voted for Social Credit not because they understood the workings of the fantastic "economics" and reactionary demagogic, but because they were thoroughly disillusioned with the U.F.A. government, because they wanted immediate relief from their burdens, and because the forces of labor were not united. However, the working class, which might have pointed out to the farmers a real way in which to throw off the burden of the crisis from their shoulders and to shift it to the rich, was not united. In voting for Social Credit they honestly believed they were voting for a social change.

After his election Aberhart hurried to the federal government at Ottawa to plead for a loan of \$18,000,000 for immediate provincial expenditures. True, he did not receive the full amount, but he established very cordial relations with the reactionary Bennett government. From Ottawa he sped to Detroit for an interview with Father Coughlin. As a result of the interview a joint statement was issued in which Coughlin throws his full weight behind the Social Credit Party and praises Aberhart for his anti-Communist stand.

The tactics of the Communist Party in the elections were to reach united front electoral agreements with the Labor candidates to defeat Aberhart. This was not achieved. The leaders of the Labor Party, whose members in the preceding parliament had consistently refused to carry out a policy of struggle and had openly flirted with Social Credit, ejected the appeals of the Communists for unity. They were the most

skillful among all the reformist leaders in Canada in finding arguments to reject the united front. The Communists, despite this opposition of the Labor leaders, nevertheless were successful in forging a whole series of united fronts in action, on the issues of relief, on the issues of unemployment insurance, in the mine fields of Alberta between the revolutionary miners' union and the United Mine Workers of America (A. F. of L.). But this united front on local issues did not develop into a united front on the major issues of the election. The responsibility here rests upon the shoulders of the Labor leaders. The sectarian methods of our Party's work hindered the Party in breaking through this sabotage of these Labor leaders.

During the election campaign the Communist election committee issued a pamphlet called, *Exposure of the Fascist Character of Aberhart's Social Credit Propaganda*. The terms "semi-fascist" and "fascist" were frequently used by our Party in characterizing the Social Credit movement, instead of a convincing expose of Aberhart's demagogery and a clear statement of its program. The effect of such a labeling was to set up a barrier between the toilers following the Social Credit leaders and the Communists. It is a movement of protest on the part of thousands of oppressed workers, farmers and middle-class people of the cities and towns against unemployment and low wages, against low prices for farm products, against big capital and for relief from these burdens. True, the movement is led by demagogues who are exploiting these radical sentiments in the interests of big capital. But the problem is to break away the masses who follow these demagogues developing towards fascism, and this depends in the first place on the degree to which Communists are able "*to mobilize the masses around a program of demands that are calculated really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crisis to the shoulders of the ruling classes. . . .*" (Seventh Congress Resolution on Comrade Dimitroff's Report.)

This error resulted in a underestimation in practice of the ability of the Social Credit Party to hoodwink the masses and to exploit their discontent. This meant in practice that our Party did not unfold a really mass campaign to expose the hollow pretenses of the Social Credit leaders. It followed from this that Alberta Communists underestimated the need for working in close cooperation with the Social Credit members and followers to convince the followers of Aberhart that their desire for better conditions could only be immediately furthered by a Farmer-Labor government which would reject the class collaboration policies of the former U.F.A. government and which would pursue a policy of struggle against capital.

And precisely here, on the issue of government, a mistake was committed by the Communists. As a matter of fact, what was the situation at the time of the elections? The people of Alberta were disillusioned with U.F.A. reformist government. They had long since abandoned the old capitalist parties. They were looking for a new way out of their plight. But the only alternative offered to them by the Communist Party was a *Soviet Canada*, which means we failed to put forward a clear positive program of united front action. *Had the Party led an energetic united front campaign for a Farmer-Labor majority which would follow*

a program of opposition to big capital and for the immediate needs of the masses the election results might have been different. The Social Credit Party frankly stated that it was out for control of the Alberta government. In the very boldness of its ambitions lies one of the reasons for its success.

Our united front tactics in the elections were too narrow. In the first place, they were not directed to the majority of the population of Alberta, the farmers. No Communists were working within the United Farmers of Alberta, the traditional organization of the Alberta wheat growers. Instead, the militant farmers are isolated from the U.F.A., having their own organization, the Farmers' Unity League. The U.F.A. members, disgusted with the leadership, have been leaving the ranks of the organization in thousands. They do not come to the military farm organization, the F.U.L., but remain unorganized and an easy prey for the Social Credit leaders.

Comrade Dimitroff, in his report at the Seventh Congress, pointed out that the Communists can under no circumstances afford to neglect the allies of the working class, the farmers and petty bourgeoisie of the towns. The Canadian Communists did not fully understand that and carried on such tactics that the middle classes became easy prey for the demagogues. The Social Credit Party was easily able, in the space of a few months, to gain the support of the majority of the Alberta farmers by means of the most hollow demagogery.

Because of the isolation of the Communists from the farmers, the fight for the united front in the Alberta election did not include, as it should have done, the nomination of U.F.A. farmer candidates pledged to a fight against the mortgage companies, the banks, and for adequate farm relief. Thus, the fight against the Social Credit leaders would have become at the same time a struggle to win allies for the working class, to win the middle classes of the towns and the toiling farmers.

Likewise, in fighting for the proletarian united front, our Party was not sufficiently bold, flexible and active. For example, our weak work within the reformist trade unions explains the fact that we were unable to bring about electoral unity in these towns and mining villages where Communist influence is strong. The mistake of the past, as for example when the Party and revolutionary miners' union referred to the reformist miners as "scabs", hang heavily over the heads of the Alberta Communists. Apart from the reformist unions, let us speak of the revolutionary miners' union. The weak political work of the Communists within the revolutionary miners' union must explain the fact that the Social Credit candidates received many votes from members of this union, and this in places where the Party itself was running candidates.

How did our Party answer the main slogan of the Social Credit leaders, "*Abolish Poverty in Alberta?*" It must be admitted that the unemployed miners, railroad and factory workers saw in this slogan something which might relieve their plight. The farmers saw in this a means whereby they would be able to purchase those goods which they cannot obtain in their present impoverished position.

It is safe to say that the Social Credit Party was able to rally the majority of farmers to its support by its demand for a "just price" on

farm products. In this way the resentment of the farmers towards the finance capital institutions was exploited for Social Credit purposes. The Communists were not able to direct the resentment of the farmers at their demand for a "just" price into militant channels. The Communists manifested an attitude of indifference towards this demand of the farmers. They hesitated, instead of taking up this really mass demand for "just prices" in order to direct it against banking and monopoly capital and to connect it up with the struggles of the workers against the high cost of living.

How did it come about that the slogans and demands advanced by the Communists and the Labor Party, demands which are known to the masses, were passed by, while those of the Social Credit Party were adopted by the masses? Here arises the necessity for closely examining the demands of our Party, as to how far they really accord with the demands of the masses and the existing level of the class struggle.

Our Parties, in the light of the report of Comrade Dimitroff, and on the basis of a concrete examination of their present methods and extent of agitation and propaganda, must come before the masses with demands which would seem within their grasp without the necessity of overthrowing capitalism and setting up Soviet Power; demands which would bring the masses into active struggles for their realization.

Our Party in Alberta, and likewise throughout Canada, has now the task of boldly and flexibly pursuing the united front tactic in a new manner, on the basis of the decisions of the Seventh Congress. A central feature of this new tactic is the perspective of building a new people's party which will represent a united front of the workers, farmers and the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, a party to which Social Credit clubs could affiliate. As a first step in this direction, the Communist Party must strive to become affiliated to the present Farmer-Labor Party, and in the most patient, convincing manner work for the adoption of an anti-capitalist program, which would not be a Stalinist program, but which would be directed against the banks, trusts and monopolies, the main enemies of the people who thrive on the misery of the people, and against the Liberal and Conservative Parties and all other bourgeois political forces. The adoption of such a tactic, and the inner conviction of its correctness on the part of every Party member, will render impossible the repetition of the failure to build a working-class united front in the Alberta elections.

The Party has drawn generally correct conclusions. It has declared that the Alberta vote was a reflection of the growing mass discontent, of masses of people anxious and eager for a way out. Our Party correctly lays the major portion of the blame on the U.F.A. and Labor Party leaders, whose policies paved the way and prepared the soil for Aberhart's victory. At the same time, our Party recognizes that the Stalinist methods of work which still persist were also partially to blame for the Aberhart landslide.

What are the next tasks facing the Party arising out of the Alberta developments? The Social Credit leaders can be unmasked providing our Party unfolds an unprecedented united front struggle to force the

Alberta government to live up to its promises. Already Aberhart is hedging. He has declared that the people must be patient, and that it will take 18 months at least before the \$25 monthly allowance would be forthcoming. His first words of reassurance were to the big investors, and not to the people who elected him in good faith in the belief that they would receive relief from their misery. He has said that the \$25 income will be given only to people who are "willing to work", thereby threatening a policy of forced labor at coolie wages. He has declared that the infamous Trades and Industry Act which outlaws strikes and eliminates "uneconomic enterprises" will be enforced. What his attitude will be to strikes is seen in his recent warning that "there will be strikes and lockouts to prevent us bringing in Social Credit". Already he is faced with the necessity of warning and threatening the "communistically-minded" among his membership. The first "fulfilment" of his pledges is seen in the decision to officially regard \$5 of the present miserable relief amounts as "social dividend", and in Aberhart's proposal to increase taxes in order to pay for the "dividends"! He has already proposed to take from the miners' unions the power to interfere in industrial accident compensation cases, and to invest this power in the Social Credit clubs.

That the Social Credit Party is a real danger—which some Communists tended to overlook—is seen in the strengthening of the Social Credit Party on a national scale. It is now proceeding to organize throughout the country, and in the recent federal elections succeeded, as a first effort, in electing 17 Members of Parliament, which is twice the number of labor candidates elected, and in defeating all the former Farmer-Labor members.

A clear line of activity and energetic work in exposing Aberhart is needed. We must not for a moment commit the disastrous mistake of identifying the supporters of Aberhart with Aberhart himself, his chief lieutenants and rich backers. Not a single Communist can assume a smug "I told you so!" attitude towards the followers of Aberhart. Such an attitude would be the worst form of self-satisfied sectarianism. To the direct contrary, the Communists must work in close, daily harmony and cooperation with the supporters of Social Credit, the while exposing in life the fallacies of this reactionary chimera. Our members must at once proceed to work within the clubs of the Social Credit Party and the branches of the United Farmers of Alberta and take measures to transfer the activities of the farmer militants into the U.F.A. for the purpose of building it into a genuine farmers' organization of struggle against big capital. This cannot be successfully carried through unless strong resistance is put up against all evidences of "Communist superiority" towards those who do not accept the full Communist program, or who may be temporarily deceived by such clever demagogues as Aberhart.

Pursuing the line so brilliantly presented by Comrade Dimitroff, the Canadian Communists can turn the victory of Aberhart into a Pyrrhic victory by transforming the present setback into a powerful movement against fascism and in defense of the remnants of democracy.

An examination of the votes cast for the Communist candidates shows a great increase over that of previous years, and in many cases the Communist candidates received greater support than the Labor Party candidates who opposed unity. This shows that a growing body of opinion is for the united front. If the danger noted in a recent editorial in the central Communist organ, that of "keeping aloof from the workers who are following the Social Credit movement", is guarded against, then the present supporters of Aberhart can be brought to see the correct paths to follow in their fight for bread.

That the leading Communists are aware of this can be judged by the following extract from the above-mentioned editorial:

"Not by aloofness nor by derision will the class-conscious workers link themselves up with and gain leadership over the workers in the Social Credit movement, but by working with them (in the Social Credit clubs as well) as comrades-in-arms in the fight for improvement of their economic conditions."

* * *

The experiences, errors and corrections of policy in the recent work of the Canadian Party can serve as useful material for all Communist Parties, and particularly in the U.S.A., Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, where Social Credit and similar movements are operating. It is necessary, while striving for joint struggle with the masses under the influence of these organizations to conduct at the same time a detailed criticism of their "panaceas" from a Communist point of view, to expose them for the false promises they are. Too little has been done in this regard. At the present time there exists no popular pamphlet or reasonably-priced book explaining Social Credit from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint.

As to the indispensable means Communists in all countries must pursue in order to prevent the forces of fascism consolidating themselves, in order to win those masses under the influence of the demagogues of the Aberhart type, in order to win for joint struggle the allies of the workers in town and country, no better conclusion to this article can be found than the clause in the Resolution of the Seventh Congress on Comrade Dimitroff's report which says:

"The defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the latter against fascism, must be the starting point and form the main content of the workers' united front in all capitalist countries. In striving to unite, under the leadership of the proletariat, the struggle of the toiling peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities, the Communists must seek to bring about the establishment of a wide anti-fascist people's front on the basis of the proletarian united front, supporting all those specific demands of these sections of the toilers which are in line with the fundamental interests of the proletariat."

What Course Are You Steering, Otto Bauer?

By PETER VIDEN

IN the December issue of *Kampf*, edited by Otto Bauer, the Menshevik Dan expressed his opinion on "the Comintern Congress, working class unity, and the Soviet problem". Dan is an enemy of Bolshevism. Thanks to the indomitable strength of Bolshevism, thanks to Lenin and Stalin, the great leaders of the Communist Party, Dan and his party friends did not succeed in leading the Russian proletariat to defeat along the road of the Second International. For years, Dan and his party friends have been predicting that the Soviet Union would soon perish. The Mensheviks have organized plots and revolts against the dictatorship of the proletariat and thereby given their support to counter-revolution. However, their prophecies were false: it is not the Soviet Union, but the counter-revolutionary plots and revolts which have broken down. Dan and his party friends set themselves the task of always traveling against the wind. This thankless task, and the constant failures they have met upon the road, only increase their dislike of Bolshevism. Consequently, it would not be worth while entering into a discussion with Dan and his party friends, if there were not other forces behind them using the services of the Mensheviks to hinder the united front. Insignificant in themselves, the Mensheviks are of value to all the enemies of the united front in the Second International; they and the Trotskyites supply the arguments against Communism, against the Soviet Union.

Dan is sufficiently wise not to make a frontal attack on the united front. On the contrary, he "declares" himself a "supporter" of the united front, refers to it as "the most important problem of the working class" and demands "a quick successful solution of this problem". It is essential merely to do away with a few unimportant things, and there can then be no doubt at all that the problem will be solved. The little things that have to be removed are: the Communist International, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the fundamental principles of the Soviet Union. If the Communists desire the united front, they will obviously be willing to agree to remove these little things that hinder it. Of course, if they do not agree to this, then, according to Dan, the united front cannot be established. What truly sincere solicitation for the establishment of the united front! In order that the flag may fly freely, first saw through the mast, then cut the string, and the flag can fly whither the wind carries it. This is Dan's idea of the "problem" of the united front.

But let him speak for himself. He writes:

"If we examine the discussion and resolutions of the last, Seventh, Congress of the Communist International from this point of view, we inevitably come to the conclusion that this Congress has contributed a great deal towards the establishment of the necessary pre-conditions for the restoration of proletarian unity.... The reports and resolutions of the Congress of the Comintern indeed contain many points which demand the sharpest criticism. But if we take the essence of the practical political decisions of the Congress, and first and foremost the basis for them contained in the numerous speeches of delegates, we cannot fail to record that essentially they signify the complete renunciation of the ideology of Communism as a branch of the working class movement which is something totally isolated from the whole of the rest of the class-conscious labor movement, and hostile to all its other sections. Henceforward, the parties affiliated to the Comintern stand in principle upon the same platform in the political, tactical and organizational sense, as that upon which the parties of the Socialist International also stand and fight."

We have always thought, up to now, that the Second International was against the dictatorship of the proletariat and in favor of peaceful development into socialism, was against the revolutionary class struggle and for class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, against converting the imperialist war into proletarian revolution and for class peace, against democratic centralism and for an international debating society which makes no binding decisions, against the united front and in favor of coalition with bourgeois parties.

Dan wants to persuade us of just the opposite. He asserts that "in the political, tactical and organizational respect" we have adopted "the same platform" as the parties of the Second International, in that case the decisions of our Congress should inspire the Second International to draw positive conclusions. Yet, strange as it may seem, the Second International has turned down the united front proposals made by the Communist International. Strange though it seems, the Czech, Swedish, and Danish Social-Democratic Parties cling to governmental coalition with the bourgeois parties and adopt repressive measures against the supporters of the united front. Strange though it may seem, not only the above-mentioned parties, but the British, Dutch, Belgian and other Social-Democrats as well condemn the dictatorship of the proletariat. Strange though it may seem, all the parties of the Second International are fighting against the principle of Soviet Power, and of democratic centralism, the organizational principles advanced and established by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. To be sure, some Social-Democratic groupings have come closer towards the principles of revolutionary Marxism; some of those people who only a few years ago were preaching "organized capitalism", who opposed the American "economic miracle" to the socialist planned economy of the Soviet Union, who put forward "Red Vienna" as a trump card against Red Moscow, and who substituted the ballot box for the revolution, have learned something from bitter experience, have thrown aside their democratic illusions and acquired some

appreciation of Bolshevism. They have begun to leave the platform of the Second International, without as yet finding in themselves the strength to take an earnest stand against the dictates of the openly reformist parties. The ground upon which many of the parties of the Second International are standing today has collapsed or become unstable. Dan, however, is accustomed to regard reality as a deplorable deviation from the theory of Menshevism. Therefore he continues:

"If the leaders of the Comintern wanted, or could afford, to ponder to the end over the new situation that has now arisen, and openly state the conclusions arising therefrom, they would be forced to admit that, henceforth, there are no compelling reasons for maintaining the split, and that there are no insuperable obstacles to the restoration of unity: *the ideological liquidation of the Comintern should be followed, in actual fact, by the immediate liquidation of its separate organizational existence.* . . . Behind the scenes of the Comintern, the possibility of liquidating it as a separate international organization has very likely already been discussed."

Although we fully understand this "modest" desire, we must nevertheless inform Dan, who is so interested in profound secrets, that the possibility of liquidating the Comintern has been as little discussed behind the scenes of the Comintern as the possibility of inviting Dan to become a member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. The Communist International is stronger than ever before. It is winning the confidence of ever greater masses of workers. It has become the leading force of the world proletariat. One must be a fool to imagine that it would "liquidate" itself and migrate to the bosom of the disintegrating Second International. Dan, however, is not so stupid as to think this seriously. Behind his apparent naivete and political slow-wittedness, there is political intriguing and sabotage of the united front. Dan says, in a careful veiled form, the very thing that the open enemies of the united front say explicitly: "If the Communists want the united front, let them join the Social-Democratic Party. For us, there is no other united front."

But Dan demands more. He demands not only the liquidation of the Communist International, but also the *abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.*

This "Socialist" regards the united front as a business transaction. He speaks about trade-union unity as a bank director might speak about the merger of capitalist firms. As far as he is concerned, the Bolsheviks are holders of a big bundle of shares. The "big bundle of shares" is the Russian proletariat. The Bolsheviks must be prevented from securing the majority of the shares in a united trade-union international. Steps must be taken to reserve shares in the Russian proletariat for the Mensheviks. Dan solves the problems affecting the destiny of the working class in terms of the stock exchange. The workers are concerned with freedom and life. The Mensheviks are concerned with securing a majority of political shares. The political speculation is disturbed under no circumstances. Yesterday, as far as he is concerned,

Moscow was a hotbed of "Revolutionism"—today it is the embodiment of "Reformism". The "banal reformism" of the Bolsheviks might even infect the various royal and republican ministers of the Second International, and as the bourgeoisie naturally attributes great importance to establishing coalition governments only with genuine revolutionaries, this would be entirely unbearable. Dan probably only fought against the October Revolution because Lenin was a reformist, and his "banal reformism" was a danger to the revolutionary movement.

After Dan, the enemy of the proletarian revolution, has introduced himself as the defender of the purity of revolutionary principles, he comes forward with his real demand. How, to use his stock exchange jargon, is the "countermine" to be placed against the proletarian united front?

In the following way:

"It will soon be discovered that it is impossible to have any serious, honest 'united front' of both internationals for any length of time if the working class movement of the Soviet Union which constitutes nine-tenths of the force of the Communist International, and dictates 99 per cent of its policy, remains outside that front. The united front 'only for the capitalist countries' will very soon turn out at best to be self-deception. It might convert the 'united' international working class movement into a bind tool of the policy of Stalin, or else into an arena of violent internal struggle, which will again destroy the newly won unity."

This is open sabotage of the united front. The Menshevik saboteur wants to make the united fighting front against war and fascism dependent upon the creation of a "united front" in the Soviet Union, i.e., upon permission being given to all Mensheviks, Trotskyites and other counter-revolutionaries to organize anti-Soviet forces in the Soviet Union itself and to let loose against the dictatorship of the proletariat all those dark forces responsible for the murder of Kirov. It is difficult to reply calmly to such monstrous proposals, but there, we do not intend to enter into discussion with Dan, but merely want to explain the meaning of this Menshevik demand to the Social-Democratic workers.

Suppose the Soviet Union allowed the Mensheviks to organize a Social-Democratic Party side by side with the Communist Party. Let us suppose for a moment that the people who build up such a party are not enemies of the Soviet government—obviously, a very unlikely hypothesis. Each party is an organization of people with the same convictions and must not only disassociate itself from other parties, but put forward its own program against the other program—otherwise this party would be quite superfluous. We would like to raise the question: who would join such a new party in the Soviet Union? The masses of the proletariat and toiling peasantry, who love Stalin and stand for the dictatorship of the proletariat and who are building socialism with such enthusiasm? No, these masses would remain true to the Communist Party, they would look on any other party with astonishment and hostility, and would reject it. Who, in that case, would join

the new party? All the dark counter-revolutionary elements which have not yet been completely destroyed, all the throwbacks of the dying world, with their dreams of sabotage and murder, all the waverers, who have not yet freed themselves from the remains of petty-bourgeois ideology—these are the people who would gather together in such a new party. All the agents of counter-revolution in Hitler Germany and in other countries would heave a sigh of relief, and give their supporters instructions to support the new party in every possible way and to use it as a tool for the struggle against the Soviet Union.

What does this mean? This means that any second party would inevitably become a counter-revolutionary party, a weapon of struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against socialist construction, a means of undermining the workers' and peasants' state. However "honest" the intentions guiding the founders of such a party, they would be unable to prevent such a development and would very soon be the bearers of the counter-revolution. Only a fool or an innocent child can refuse to understand that. But anyone who understands this (and every politically thinking individual must do so), but nevertheless stubbornly repeats this demand, is an enemy of the Soviet Union. To legalize the Mensheviks, the Trotskyites and so forth in the Soviet Union would be to allow counter-revolution to penetrate into the strongest fortress of the world proletariat and to undermine it and simplify the task of fascism.

We, Communists, want to establish, together with all the Social-Democratic workers and parties, the united front against fascism. The Menshevik Dan, however, wants a different "united front". He wants to destroy the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, he wants to organize a party in the U.S.S.R. to fight against Stalin and the Bolsheviks, and thus actually to create a "united front" of all the counter-revolutionary elements. What is more, Dan declares that without this "united front" the international united front against fascism is impossible, that, for the Second International, the establishment of the united front with the Communists must be made dependent upon this other "united front". He thereby plays the game of all the enemies of the united front. Knowing full well that the dictatorship of the proletariat never can and never will allow the existence of a second party, that the working class of the Soviet Union does not intend to clear the way for counter-revolution, he really makes his evasive declarations in order to say: "The united front is impossible. We must not allow it to be organized. And we, Mensheviks, will do our utmost to prevent it."

There is nothing surprising in this. We should not have dealt with this article by Dan at all, were it not for the fact that it was published in a magazine edited by Otto Bauer. Otto Bauer did not limit himself to merely publishing this article, but he stressed it and supplemented it with a few phrases in the section entitled, "In the Soviet Union", where he writes:

"The last Congress of Soviets promised to democratize the Soviet Constitution. Democracy is not only equal suffrage.

There is equal suffrage in Hitler Germany. The basis of all democracy is freedom of all opinion and the right to fight within the framework of the constitution to influence the decision of the majority of the people. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International made a proposal to the Labor and Socialist International to organize the united front. The Russian Social-Democrats also belong to the Labor and Socialist International. The Russian Social-Democrats in the Labor and Socialist International were boldly in favor of united action with the Communist International and of the unconditional support of the Soviet Union in case of war. But apparently the bureaucracy of the G.P.U. has not yet taken note of this fact."

Otto Bauer is not a mere private individual, but a leading politician of the Second International. All that he says and writes is of political importance, has a definite political aim, and requires a political evaluation. Therefore, we ask with all seriousness and emphasis: what does Otto Bauer want? What is his aim in making declarations of this kind? What political results does he want to achieve?

Otto Bauer has declared himself to be a supporter of the united front. He has declared that he considers that the establishment of the united front on an international scale and joint struggle with the Soviet Union against war and fascism is a most important task. The leader of the Communist Party of Austria, Koplenig, at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, referred to the fact that Otto Bauer had adopted this position, and advocated closer contact.

Otto Bauer, however, has not only hesitated, but has retreated and changed his policy. He has written a review of Souvarine's disgusting libel against Stalin, and under the cover of "objectivity" he has allowed himself to make attacks against the great leader of the Soviet Union and the world proletariat. He has borrowed a number of Trotskyite arguments and spoken about "police dictatorship" in the Soviet Union and about "superfluous cruelties" against the kulaks. In the December issue of *Kampf* he continued to pursue this line, not only by printing Dan's article, but by giving it his support in the above-mentioned note. What was he out to achieve? What course is he steering?

This road leads not only to complete isolation but to the camp of the enemies of the united front and of the Soviet Union.

"But," Otto Bauer will object, "I express my opinion openly. Dan equally openly expresses his. Everybody openly expresses his opinion. You can enter into a discussion with us. But how does this harm the united front?"

We are for open comradely criticism. Political discussion is also essential when we have the united front. We shall discuss all our differences in a friendly and businesslike spirit, but there are "arguments" used against us which are counter-revolutionary, which are raised merely to hinder the united front and thus to strengthen the class enemy. We shall react to such arguments and such questions in a different way than we do to practical political differences. Let Otto Bauer call to mind the "Doriot case". When Doriot was expelled from the Communist

Party of France, Otto Bauer was most indignant: "The Communists do not recognize any freedom of opinion! They have expelled Doriot for being in favor of the united front." Will Otto Bauer assert the same today? Doriot was expelled because he came close to counter-revolution in his arguments and in the manner he raised political issues. Today, even those who once defended him must understand that he is an agent of counter-revolution, a tool of Laval and a tool of Hitler fascism. The Communist Party of France displayed greater rigidity in immassing him as an enemy in good time.

Freedom of opinion exists for those who are not enemies of the Soviet Union, enemies of the united front. We do not however offer freedom of opinion to our enemies. We do not enter into friendly discussion with enemies. Enemies are crushed.

It is an old trick of our enemies to find a contradiction between Stalin and the Soviet Union. Our friends know and our enemies must take note of the following. There is no contradiction between Stalin and the Soviet Union. To entertain a "positive" attitude towards the Soviet Union and at the same time to fight against Stalin is sheer hypocrisy. What is understood by Stalin, there cannot be no Soviet Union today. There would be no socialist construction, there would be no victory of socialism. For the proletariat of the Soviet Union and for all Communists, Stalin is not only the embodiment of all that is good but he is actually the man who in the struggle against a world of enemies, wavemakers, and wreckers, did everything that was right and necessary, and consummated the most magnificent achievement in the history of mankind. Otto Bauer acknowledges this acknowledgement. But at the same time he wants to persuade the world that it was a tame by relentless violence, and that the brain is the "guiding organ" preventing others from achieving similar things.

How sensible it would be to think that the world can be changed by violence alone. The gigantic and heroic creative work performed by Stalin, the magnificence of his conception and far-sightedness, is due to his creative forces. Without him the Soviet system would not exist. Stalin, the Bolshevik Party, and the Soviet Union form one inseparable whole, where the brain, the will, and the energy of man are fused into a unit. An attack on Stalin is an attack on the Soviet Union, the defense of which Otto Bauer believes is the most important task of the working class.

Therefore, there can be no agreements between ourselves and the Trotskyites and Mensheviks. They can either say openly their views to the effect that they are the friends of the Soviet Union and are entirely hostile to Stalinism, but we shall regard them as working class hypocrites. Or they can openly repudiate Trotskyism but the Trotskyites are a serious danger threatening the working class. The class activities of the Trotskyites, Otto Bauer can defend them in front of the French Socialists, but they surely do not deserve to be supported. Arguments against the U.S.S.R. would be useless. They can make arguments against the united front. They do not dare to base themselves on the successes of Stalinism to prove the correctness of the Soviet

Union. This is why they spread legends about the "oppression of the Russian workers", about "police dictatorship", about the "treacherous foreign policy of the Soviet Union", about the "liquidation of the world revolution through Stalin", etc. They demand that "democracy be introduced" into the Soviet Union. They demand to be allowed to return to the U.S.S.R., in order to fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat. They demand, in a word, the overthrow of the Soviet government, they demand freedom of action against socialist construction for all backward and counter-revolutionary elements, they are striving to undermine the mighty bulwark against war and fascism. They are in the front ranks of our deadly enemies. There can be no agreement with them.

Like the Trotskyites and Mensheviks, Otto Bauer demands the "democratization of the Soviet Union". Apparently he cannot imagine democracy without political parties and the inanities of parliament. He does not want to recognize that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a new form of democracy, higher than bourgeois parliamentarism. With the final victory of socialism, Soviet democracy is developing wider and wider.

"At a time when more and more bourgeois countries are abolishing the last remnants of the voting rights of their populations, the Soviet Union is steadily approaching the complete abolition of all restrictions on universal suffrage." (V. M. Molotov, in "Report on Constitutional Changes" at Seventh Congress of Soviets, 1935.)

But Otto Bauer is renewing his old talk about the "dictatorship over the proletariat", the "personal dictatorship of Stalin", the "rule of the G.P.U. bureaucracy" and speaks of Hitler Germany, incidentally, in the same breath. We would not like to think that he intends putting the fascist dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat on the same level. This most stupid, most reactionary "argument" is now rarely used even by the most downright reformists. But how are we to understand it if Bauer declares: "Democracy is not merely equal suffrage. Equal suffrage exists also in Hitler Germany." Formerly the Social-Democrats said the words "Swastika and Soviet Star" in one breath; does Otto Bauer want now to bring this shameful phrase to life again? Has any Communist ever declared that equal suffrage is the beginning and end of democracy? Proletarian democracy is the domination of the working class and all toilers in the state. Proletarian democracy is, further, freedom for the workers in the factories and workshops and the peasants in their collective farms. It is unlimited opportunity for all toilers to occupy key positions in the economic life and in the state, it is the complete equality of political, social, and cultural rights for all toilers (and not purely formal "equality in the eyes of the law" which exists under bourgeois democracy). It is the creative initiative of the masses, the spontaneous upsurge which we are observing today in the Stakhanov movement, and much more besides. It is quite obvious, in addition, that this democracy, existing within a hostile

ring, demands at the same time the greatest vigilance that this democracy shall not be extended to counter-revolutionaries of all shades, that the proletarian dictatorship fight against all counter-revolutionaries, be they whiteguards, Trotskyites or Mensheviks. These are all essential measures to safeguard the Soviet Union. Or perhaps we shall once more be ordered to wait until another murder is committed, like the murder of Kirov, to wait until a new murderer arises out of this small handful of plotters. Thanks for the advice that we give freedom of thought and deed to counter-revolutionaries. Soviet democracy does not require Social-Democratic advice for its further development. Otto Bauer has often given his advice to the Soviet Union. He advised it to begin building up, not heavy, but light industry. He advised it to retard the agrarian revolution and to come to an agreement with the kulaks. He has given the Soviet Union much more advice of this kind. Otto Bauer will understand himself that it would have been a misfortune for the Soviet Union if it had followed his advice, and had used the brain as a "retarding organ". The Bolsheviks have led the working class from victory to victory. Let people *learn* from them, instead of *teaching* them.

Otto Bauer is saturated with liberalism. Perhaps this is the cause of all his mistakes. He applies his scale of liberal conceptions of freedom and liberal democracy to Soviet freedom and Soviet democracy. But in class society, democracy is radically different from democracy in classless society. What is the use of political parties, parliamentary elections with lists of rival candidates, and parliamentary battles to form governments, in a classless society? Parliamentarism is the most developed form of democracy in class society, but the classless society will never return to this form. There can be no return to liberalism and its ideals, there can only be the march forward to new, incomparable forms of liberty, democracy and the expression of the will of the masses, as new and incomparable as socialism and the classless society. Soviet democracy is gradually freeing itself from all restrictions. It will take over some of the elements of parliamentary democracy, just as communism will take over some of the elements of the great bourgeois culture. But these elements become combined in a new way, they become endowed with a new form and a new significance in the new social order, they constitute the succession of all great things created in the past, without ever returning us to this past. Elements of parliamentary democracy will be introduced into a new world, but parliamentary democracy will never return.

Otto Bauer thinks like a historian. He ought to be able to accept the historic process instead of stubbornly repeating: "The Social-Democratic Party must be allowed to exist in the Soviet Union, parliamentarism must be restored in some form or another." He ought to understand that liberalism is dead, irrevocably, once and for all, that now, more than ever before, we demand from every political leader, in the working class movement that he adopt an unambiguous, unconditional position. The wider the world front, the front of capitalist counter-revolution headed by Hitler fascism, and the front of the working class, of the anti-fascist masses, led by the Soviet Union, the stronger

becomes the need of making an unequivocal choice between these two fronts, the more untenable is the policy based on the principle of "on the one hand, yes, and on the other hand, no". Otto Bauer has declared himself on the side of the Soviet Union. In an earlier article in *Kampf*, he recognized the leading role of the Soviet Union; and then declared the most important task is to be the mobilization of the masses in defense of the Soviet Union, but his political line is in contradiction to this statement. He sows doubts about the policy of the Soviet Union. Over and over again he discovers things he does not like. He links up with the Mensheviks and provides the enemies of the Soviet Union with arguments. His pessimistic "objective approach" will not fill a single waverer with determination to really defend the Soviet Union, and fight ardently for the united front. On the contrary, Bauer's approach to questions offers to the wavering elements justification for their wavering, and gives the enemies of the united front arguments, which are the more useful to them since they originate from a man who has declared himself to be a supporter of the united front. No, this is not the way to assist in revolutionizing the masses or to win new forces to support the great cause of the united front, to defend the Soviet Union. This is the method of damping down the flame, of shattering the front by "buts" and "ifs", by "on the one hand" and "on the other hand". This is a refined form of the policy of the reformists.

If Otto Bauer really wants to help consolidate the united front and defend the Soviet Union, he must proceed along a different road. Let him discuss things with the Communist International, let him criticize us and offer suggestions as to how to achieve the united front more quickly. But behind all this we must feel what we have not felt up to now; namely, that he is consistently and unreservedly joining in the united front, that he is possessed of consistent and unqualified friendship for the Soviet Union. Not false "objectivity" in the interests of the reformists and Mensheviks, but a real desire to do everything that will assist the united front and do nothing that will injure it.

Trotskyite arguments and Menshevik demands are milestones along the road to the enemies of the united front and the Soviet Union. Does Otto Bauer really want to travel along that road? Or will he take another road, the road which revolutionizes the masses, the road of the united front, the road of fighting unity with the Soviet Union and the Communist International?

Soukup and Stivin, Strike-Breakers of the United Front of the International Proletariat

By V. K.

IT is with bitterness that the international proletariat calls to mind the decision taken by the Labor and Socialist International on October 12. This decision rejected the proposal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International for joint action by both Internationals on an international scale against the armed invasion of Ethiopia by Italian imperialism, and against the growing danger of a new world war. Included among the five Social-Democratic parties responsible for preventing united anti-war action by the international proletariat is the Social-Democracy of Czechoslovakia. At the session of the Executive Committee of the Second International, as against the viewpoint of 17 representatives of the other Social-Democratic parties who declared themselves in favor of accepting the proposals of the Communist International, the representatives of both Social-Democratic parties of Czechoslovakia—the German and the Czech—together with the English, Dutch, Swedish and Danish Social-Democratic leaders, demanded that the Executive Committee reject the proposal of the Comintern. Among those who took this shameful action, we find also the leaders of Czech Social-Democracy. The names of these representatives to the Executive Committee of the Second International—Frantisec Soukup and Josef Stivin—call forth the same disgust among the international proletariat as does the name of Scheidemann.

The workers of Czechoslovakia consider it a disgrace to themselves that the representatives of their country, in particular, came forward in the Executive Committee of the Second International as opponents of international united action against war, and that the Czech Social-Democratic Party is one of the five Social-Democratic parties condemned by the proletariat of the whole world. The position of the working class of Czechoslovakia on the question of united working class action and in particular on the question of the united front against the warmongers, has nothing in common with the position adopted by the representatives of Czech Social-Democracy when the vote was taken in the Executive Committee of the Second International. The manner in which Soukup and Stivin (and Shefer from the German Social-Democrats of Czechoslovakia) voted at the Brussels session has called forth tremendous indignation among the toiling masses of Czechoslovakia. The votes given by them also contradict the opinions of the majority of the Social-Democratic workers, officials, and honest leading workers in the ranks of Social-Democracy.

The Social-Democratic workers realize that their leaders are to blame for the differences which exist between the Czech Social-Democratic Party and the Social-Democratic parties of the majority of other countries. The representatives of 17 Social-Democratic parties of other countries at Brussels were in favor of accepting the proposal of the Comintern; but the representatives of Czech Social-Democracy were stubbornly opposed. Czech Social-Democracy is guided by leaders who have made it their profession to betray the working class and split its ranks. Pursuing a policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie, and occupying ministerial benches, they slavishly obey the orders of the bourgeoisie, and strive to the utmost to do their will. These leaders (for example Bechyne—the chief leader of the Right wing of Social-Democracy) say they would sooner cut off their right hands than lose their ministerial seats.

The reactionary ministerial clique of leaders who have become thoroughly bourgeois, and who have caused tremendous harm to the working class for several decades, brought Czech Social-Democracy to reject the international united front. This clique has on its conscience countless acts of treachery against the interests of the working class. If the Social-Democratic workers wish to put an end to the treacherous activities of these leaders, they must secure their removal. Soukup and Stivin, who are in the Executive Committee of the Second International, represent this reactionary clique of leaders of Czech Social-Democracy.

Frantisec Soukup is the traditional representative of Czech Social-Democracy in the Executive Committee of the Socialist International. Soukup is an example of the Social-Democratic leaders common in pre-war days, who in spite of their treacherous policy both before and after the war have always posed as people who have rendered great services to the working class movement. Soukup willingly accepts the title of "the patriarch of Socialism", but he lives up to it only by his theoretical gestures, his gray hair under his broad-brimmed hat and his flowing tie. By profession, Soukup is a lawyer. He arrived at the leadership of the Social-Democratic movement under the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy, in connection with the struggle of the Czech proletariat for universal suffrage in 1905. From 1907 onwards, Soukup has been a deputy of Social-Democracy in the Austrian Council of State. As an agitator, Soukup covered himself with glory by repeating the slogans of Bebel and Jaures in very flowery terms. There are numerous satirical quips connected with the name Soukup, which the bourgeoisie is always using when they want to jeer at socialism and to show the inconsistency of Social-Democracy. Soukup's favorite saying, "There will be neither kings nor priests" in Czechoslovakia, was frequently recalled after the war, when Alexander, the Serbian King, bestowed the Order of Saint Sabbas on Soukup.

In pre-war days, Soukup was wont to thunder against Austrian militarism in words and to demand that the Hapsburg rulers be placed on trial before a people's court. He knew how to declaim about "war against war" and, as one who participated in the Basle Congress (1912), how to wax eloquent about his joy at the solemn scene of the taking

of the oath at the Basle cathedral, when the Second International pledged to fight against war. However, Soukup also knew, in the old Austria, how to combine a monarchist program with socialism. And when the war broke out in 1914, he forgot all his anti-war slogans, all his bombastic utterances against the Hapsburg monarchy, he forgot his oath at the Basle cathedral. His chief care after the outbreak of the war was to assure the government of the loyalty of Czech Social-Democracy to the Austrian monarchy and to persuade the workers that any action against the war was madness.

In his loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Soukup went so far that when a messenger came to him in 1915 from Masaryk, carrying a secret message written on a piece of paper hidden in a button, he handed the messenger over to the Austrian police. This deed earned Soukup the honorable title of the "button hero".

During the duration of the war Soukup persisted in defending the pro-Austrian policy of Czech Social-Democracy, arguing that the endeavor to establish an independent Czech state was an illusion. This, however, did not prevent Soukup, when this policy proved bankrupt, from joining the other bourgeois current—the "national movement", in which he played the role of "the hero of October 28". In writing in one of his books of the history of the downfall of Austria-Hungary and the rise of the Czech republic, he managed to depict himself as the grave-digger of Austria and the liberator of the Czech people. After the war, Frantisec Soukup was for some time Minister of Justice in the "national coalition", and took an active part in putting through the land reforms. "Excessively curious" workers were able to establish that Soukup became very wealthy after this.

However, Soukup became worthy of a prominent political post in Czechoslovakia only after he played the role in 1920 of one of the chief culprits in the split of the working class movement in Czechoslovakia. It was then that he brought out the gendarmes to seize the House of Labor and helped in the bloody suppression of the general strike which took place in December, 1920, under Communist slogans. From that time onwards, Soukup has fought against communism, and for many years has been concocting calumnies against the Soviet Union.

Soukup considered it a great honor to become the sponsor of various counter-revolutionary emigrant organizations of the Russian, Ukrainian and Georgian Mensheviks. At the same time, since the disgust of the workers, including the Social-Democratic workers, towards Soukup was growing, the latter expected the bourgeoisie to honor him by electing him a second time to the post of President of the Senate.

As an orator also, Soukup became a comic figure. His oratorical gesticulations develop into acrobatics; he knows how to weep touchingly at the right moment, and is proud of his functions as professional scribe who finds it equally easy to compose memorial eulogies and First of May verses.

This is Frantisec Soukup, whom the reactionary clique of leaders of Czech Social-Democracy consider a worthy member of the leading bodies of the Second International.

Josef Stivin is the other member of the Executive Committee of the Socialist International delegated by Czech Social-Democracy. Stivin was chosen representative to the Executive Committee in 1935, after the sudden death of Leo Winter, who represented the more Left current of Czech Social-Democracy. It is difficult to find an example of a more checkered life among the renegades of socialism than the life of Josef Stivin. Already before the war Stivin was one of the leaders of Czech Social-Democracy, and led the young Social-Democratic press. He adhered to the current known as the so-called "orthodox Marxists" and "internationalists". The war revealed him in his true colors. We remember how, as a sergeant-major in the Austrian army, Josef Stivin, in letters from the Galician front sang the praises of war under the banner of the Austrian Empire. He wrote: "Let us drive out the Russians", and agitated for support for the war till the final victory of the Austrian monarchy. Stivin condemned not only every idea of the possibility of resistance to war on the part of the working class but when, in 1917, Czech writers issued a manifesto against the national oppression of the Czech people, Josef Stivin organized action against them. He was one of the chief defenders of the pro-Austrian policy of Czech Social-Democracy during the war.

After the fall of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and the establishment of the Czechoslovakian Republic, a change took place in Josef Stivin: he was reincarnated as a radical Socialist. Stivin led the radical current in Czech Social-Democracy, sang praises to Liebknecht, and threatened the bourgeoisie with Bolshevism.

Josef Stivin played the part of a radical Socialist until the first government coalition was formed in Czechoslovakia under the leadership of Social-Democracy, and the bourgeoisie began to throw big concessions to the Social-Democratic leaders. Josef Stivin quickly changed his coat, and from simulating the revolutionary rebel he became the most passionate defender of coalition with the bourgeoisie, of ministerialism. He was finally absolved of all his old sins by the bourgeoisie when the split took place in Social-Democracy, and together with Soukup, Bechyne, Meisner and others, hurled himself with fury and hatred against the followers of the Third International, and ardently threw himself into the battle against the Communist Party, which was then formed in Czechoslovakia.

Having cringed his way up to the post of Vice-Speaker of Parliament, Josef Stivin considered his chief task, as editor-in-chief of the central organ of Social-Democracy, the *Pravo Lidu*, to carry on a constant stream of calumny against the Communists and the Soviet Union, considering no means too vile for the purpose. Stivin always opposed the united front with infinite hatred and deservedly belongs among those "leaders" who are most hated by the Czech Social-Democratic workers and officials. When Stivin was delegated to the Executive Committee of the Second International to take the place of Leo Winter, the Social-Democratic workers considered it an act of provocation, not only because the current represented previously by Leo Winter was left without a representatives, not only because in choosing a successor to Winter

the leadership of Social-Democracy did not reckon with the growing desire among the Social-Democratic workers and officials for the united front, but also because in the person of Josef Stivin a man was chosen, side by side with Soukup, for the Executive Committee of the Second International who was notorious as the most out-and-out opponent of the united front and the most vulgar inciter against the Communists. The selection of Stivin at a time when it was known that the Executive Committee of the Second International would be deciding the question of joint international action on the part of the toilers was a slap in the face to all the Social-Democratic supporters of the united front.

The attitude of Czech Social-Democracy towards the Second International is also instructive. So long as none of the Social-Democratic parties in the Second International favored the united front, the Czech Social-Democratic leaders rejected all the proposals of the Communists for a united front on the grounds that an agreement must first be arrived at by the Executive Committees of the Socialist and Communist Internationals. Thus, they showed themselves to be the most obedient members of the Socialist International. When, however, the relation of forces in the Second International changed, and the number of Social-Democratic parties favoring the united front increased, the Czech Social-Democratic leaders began to change their arguments. Now that the representatives of 17 Social-Democratic parties have voted in the Executive Committee of the Second International in favor of accepting the proposals of the Comintern for joint international action, the Czech Social-Democratic leaders have begun to change their tone. How many times have we read statements in the *Pravo Lidu* threatening that Czech Social-Democracy would not permit the Second International to tell them how they should act on the question of the united front? Whereas previously the Social-Democratic press in slandering the Communists wrote about "orders from Moscow", now, in attacking the Social-Democratic parties who support the united front, they are beginning to write about "orders from Brussels".

It is very unpleasant for the reactionary leaders of Czech Social-Democracy, who are striving to retain the good-will of the bourgeoisie by keeping wide the breach in the working class, that the majority of the other Social-Democratic parties have declared themselves in favor of accepting the proposals of the Comintern. The Czech Social-Democratic leaders now attack not only the Communists, but the French Socialists, Zyromski, Blum and others as well. They are denouncing the "brainless policy" of the French Socialists, and they are infuriated when their lying assertions that the united front in France is helping to strengthen fascism are disproven by the results of the elections and the scope of the anti-fascist movement in France. As against the actions of the French Socialists and the Social-Democratic parties of other countries, they point to the policy of the Social-Democratic parties of Denmark and Sweden where, as in Czechoslovakia and in Belgium, the Social-Democratic leaders participate in the bourgeois governments.

Czech Social-Democracy is now the most reactionary section of the Second International. The leaders of Czech Social-Democracy want to

continue the policy which in a number of countries has led to catastrophe. The reactionary Social-Democratic leaders of Czechoslovakia want Social-Democracy to continue to play the role of the weapon which splits the working class, the weapon of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The Czech Social-Democratic leaders are beginning to attack the Social-Democratic parties of other countries which favor a united front with Communists. They are prepared to break with the Second International and split it, should the Executive Committee of the Second International, as a result of the pressure of the masses, take a stand in favor of the united proletarian front.

At the session of the Executive Committee of the Socialist International held in Brussels on October 12, Soukup and Stivin succeeded, by resorting to threats, in preventing the Socialist International from enforcing upon Czech Social-Democracy the decision of the majority of the members of the Executive Committee on the united front with the Communists. Moreover, they forced the majority of the Second International to yield to the resistance of five Social-Democratic parties and to reject the proposal of the Communist International. This method actually worked. On October 12, the Executive Committee of the Socialist International, at the insistence of five parties, rejected the proposal of the Communist International.

If the present reactionary leadership continues to dominate and to persist in the policy of smashing the united front and sabotaging international unity of action, the Social-Democratic workers of Czechoslovakia will become more and more divorced from their brothers in other countries and will be brought to national isolation.

The Social-Democratic workers of Czechoslovakia are therefore confronted with the following tremendously important task: they must not allow themselves to be isolated from the international movement for united working class action, which is meeting with more and more support in other Social-Democratic parties and in the Second International. They should understand that the sabotage of the blacklegs, of the opponents of the united front, must be broken down, that the reactionary ministerial clique must be eliminated from the leadership of Czech Social-Democracy in order that it should cease serving as a barrier to the international united front of the working class.

The Social-Democratic workers in Czechoslovakia must force the withdrawal of Soukup and Stivin, arrant opponents of the united front and obedient servants of the reactionary bourgeoisie, from the Executive Committee of the Socialist International, and must see to it that they are replaced by representatives who would vote in the spirit of the wishes of the whole of the working class of Czechoslovakia, namely, for joint action by the two Internationals, for a united international working class front, against war and fascism. This will help the united front of the international proletariat in the future to become the force that will defend the interests of the toiling masses and of the peoples of Czechoslovakia should German fascism threaten them. It is in this spirit that the Communists of Czechoslovakia will influence the Social-Democratic workers who are steadily being drawn closer to them by their joint striving for united militant action by the working class.

Rudolph Claus

ON December 17, 1935, the Hitler gang, the cowardly band of war-mongers, hangmen and robbers, murdered Rudolph Claus, a German worker. The victim was an invalid, 90 per cent incapacitated during the World War, one of the millions of toilers, who, as the fascist hangmen and charlatans usually describe it, have sacrificed their health "on the altar of the fatherland". Claus was not murdered in secret like thousands of other class-conscious workers in Germany who have been tortured to death in fascist dungeons or "shot while attempting to escape". They gave him a court "trial". The fascists were unable to prove the charges of committing murders leveled against Claus. And so they beheaded him because he was the organizer of aid for the victims of fascist terror, because he assisted the wives and children of the workers who were tortured and killed by the fascists. *For the first time they have carried out the death sentence against a man whom they could only accuse of defending his Communist convictions to the bitter end, to his last breath.*

They have beheaded Rudolph Claus at the very time when long queues are standing in the streets of Germany outside the foodshops, when the hungry toiling people are indignant at the rule of the fascist executioners and hangmen.

The increase in unemployment, the high cost of living, the shortage of meat and fats, are all results of the rule of the fascists. It is they who have reduced the German people to conditions of hunger.

The intensification of unbridled terror is closely connected with the increase in the discontent of the masses.

"What is important is that the Communists now see that there is no leniency for them", wrote the fascist press on the occasion of the execution of Comrade Claus.

The whole world sees from these actions that the regime of the butcher dictatorship is unstable, that it is quaking in the expectation of the hour of reckoning. It is precisely the knowledge of its instability which inspires the fascist government to arrange orgies of brown terror. In Wupperthal, 600 workers, Communists, Social-Democrats and non-party workers, were brought before the court after being subjected to agonies of torture. In Hamburg, 72 workers, headed by Andrei the Communist, were made to stand before the court of the murderers; in Alton, 22 workers; in Berlin, as a result of the so-called Richardstrasse trial, 23 workers were sentenced to severe punishments and the death sentence was passed on seven of them.

As far as the fascists are concerned, to use Goering's words, "grenades are more important than fats". It is becoming more and more clear to the masses that the brown bandits are seeking a way out in war. The prisons and concentration camps are full to overflowing, crammed with Communists, Social-Democrats, Catholics, peasants, small

traders, and even members of the fascist party who have become convinced that they have been insolently and unceremoniously deceived. In short, people are languishing in prison who have dared in any form whatsoever to express their discontent at the existing fascist system of hunger, terror, and war preparations. But the abyss between the fascist dictatorship and the broad masses is widening. And the fascist robbers are grasping at the executioner's axe in order to frighten the people.

Who was Rudolph Claus and why was he executed? Rudolph Claus came from a working class family, of people who took an active part in the Social-Democratic movement. When still a young man, in 1909, he began to work in the ranks of the Socialist youth. Even at that time he was fascinated by the revolutionary activity of Karl Liebknecht. As a young man of twenty, Claus, an opponent of the imperialist war, suffered all the "joys" of Prussian barrack drill, and as soon as war broke out was sent to the front. The trials of the war, which crippled Claus (one of his arms was totally paralyzed, and the other deformed), made of him an active revolutionary, an irreconcilable enemy of the agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement, the social-chauvinists. In 1920 Claus joined the Communist Party of Germany.

In 1921, when Severing's police provoked the Mansfeld workers, Claus, a cripple, fought courageously shoulder to shoulder with his class comrades. On April 8, 1921, the Hamburg Emergency Tribunal sentenced him to penal servitude for life. True, after the assassination of Rathenau, Claus came under the amnesty. But right until the last minute the class of exploiters and its venal courts did not forgive Claus for participating in the armed fighting.

First, as one of the "amnestied", he was transferred from the penal prison to an ordinary one, in order to be brought up for trial a second time for the same acts in connection with which the "amnesty" had been declared. However, a powerful movement of mass protest shattered this disgraceful game, and Claus had to be released.

Nevertheless, the class justice of the bourgeois Weimar Republic and subsequently of the "Third Empire" did not forget the victim it had once been deprived of. In the years of storm and strife, in 1923, Claus took part in the struggle of the workers for emancipation. And once more he fell into the hands of Weimar "justice". This time he was paid with interest for the 1922 failure. He was sentenced to eight years hard labor. He actually had to serve half of his term of imprisonment. In 1928 there was another amnesty, and he was released from prison. But right up until the last minute, he was persecuted by the hatred of the exploiters, who were infuriated at the fact that they had not been able to deal with this particular victim previously. Foaming at the mouth, the bloody judges branded him as "one who took part in the bloody outrages of Max Holtz", thus trying to "justify" the death sentence brought in against Claus. Shame upon those "democratic" organs of the foreign press which, like a certain Czech Press Bureau, spread further this attempt "to justify" the execution of Claus, thus helping the fascist bandits who hold sway in Germany to cover up the *real* reason for the execution of Rudolph Claus.

Ever since Claus left his prison cell, his life belonged to the political prisoners, to the proletarians, whose fate he had experienced fully himself. With tremendous energy and self-effacement, he devoted himself to his work as an instructor of the International Labor Defense. The development of the I.L.D. organizations in Middle Germany was, to a considerable extent, the result of the heroic work of Claus.

After the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship, Claus remained at his fighting post, to afford assistance to the victim of the new regime.

He was once more arrested in 1933, thrown into prison, and from there transferred to a concentration camp. There he was tortured according to all the rules of the "art" displayed by the brown hangmen. All means were employed to force him to divulge confidential information, to make a traitor of him; his teeth were knocked out, the nails stripped off his toes, the wounds on his feet did not heal. He was tortured by every possible means. But Rudolph Claus firmly maintained his loyalty to his class, to his movement, to his Party.

When the brown hangmen decided that they had finally broken down the vitality of the invalid, he was released. But he immediately threw himself once more into the work, carrying out his fighting duty. When the arrest and murder of a number of leading workers of the I.L.D., in the beginning of 1934, dealt a severe blow at the movement, Claus, still very ill as a result of the tortures he had so recently suffered, immediately stepped into the breach. He joined the Central Committee of the I.L.D. of Germany in order to help organize aid for the victims of fascist terror and the struggle to release Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the German proletariat.

Even in the severest underground conditions, Rudolph Claus never for a single moment ceased to seek out new ways and means of working, striving to draw into the anti-fascist fighting front the workers who still stand aloof. He fought with all his might to establish the united front. And if it has been possible to obtain considerable successes for the united front in Berlin, in just this sphere of solidarity, it has been due to the services rendered by Claus.

Six months of turbulent, successful work passed by, and the police sleuth-hounds once more picked up the trail of Claus and seized him. Suffering severe tortures, Claus did not capitulate, and wrote the following in one of his last letters before the sentence was brought in:

"I am fully responsible for my political activity. . . . Many privations will have to be endured before we have passed through these times. But everything can be borne for the sake of our convictions."

He courageously suffered the last torture, and he and his wife heroically withstood the last moral test. She was arrested, brought to him in his death cell, and from there transferred to the concentration camp. He died a heroic death, as proletarian revolutionaries, people of the Comintern, the people who have passed through the school of Lenin and Stalin, meet their death. The public prosecutor asked Claus whether he had anything to say. Claus replied: "This is political

murder. This is class justice. The proletariat will avenge my death."

The fascists no longer make difficulties for themselves by searching for proofs supporting the accusations of "murders committed", and the execution of Claus is noteworthy in this respect. As a motive for the sentence, the murderous fascist judges declared:

"First and foremost, criminal design is being punished. The accused, by his activities and the former terms of punishment he has served, has proved that there can be no question of his reforming as regards his political convictions. Therefore the Senate could adopt no other but the highest form of punishment, and brought in the death sentence."

This motive and the declaration made by Ribbentrop on the same day that Claus was executed, to the effect that not a single convinced anti-fascist will in future be released from prison, *constitute the most definite, direct menace that the death sentence will be brought in against Comrade Thaelmann and tens of thousands of imprisoned anti-fascist fighters.*

* * *

Not only in Germany, but throughout the whole world, this new crime committed by the fascist hangmen must call forth an increased struggle for the release of the victims of fascism, for the release of Ernst Thaelmann. In memory of Claus and of tens of thousands who have been killed and tortured in the dungeons of the Gestapo (Secret Police), the toilers must do all in their power to wrest all political prisoners from the hands of the fascist hangmen. In many towns of Europe, protests and demonstrations against the murder of Claus are multiplying. In the declaration of protest signed by former Reichstag deputies, Social-Democrats and Communists, including Max Braun, Breuer, and Breitscheid, Koenen, Dengel and Munzenberg, published in *Populaire* of December 22, 1935, it is rightly stated that:

"By the force of your protest throughout the world, put an end to the murders and barbarous outrages which are taking place in the 'Third Empire'.

"Only by means of active fraternal solidarity for the cause for which Rudolph Claus gave his life, can we prevent new executions, fresh murders. Solidarity alone can stop all the tortures to which Thaelmann, Mirendorff, Shuhmacher, Hoelman, Neuebauer and Ossietsky are being subjected in fascist prisons. Solidarity alone can wrest our brothers from the claws of death and torture, can give them back their freedom."

Delegations of the most varied sections of the population are knocking at the door of the fascist embassies. This movement must not cease until the bloodthirsty fascist beasts release their victims. We must weld still closer the circle of national indignation against the brown plague, we must surround its agents in all countries with hatred, we must attack them at every step. It is the duty of the international proletariat to help the German working class in its struggle for emanci-

pation and first and foremost in its struggle to release its leader, Ernst Thaelmann.

One of the last appeals issued by Rudolph Claus during his illegal work, declared:

"Only through joint struggle of the German proletariat and the workers of the whole world will the fight on behalf of Thaelmann end in success. Intensify the struggle inside fascist Germany! Set up Thaelmann defense committees everywhere!"

Millions throughout the whole world are following this call. The fighting front against fascism, for the release of Thaelmann, will spread still wider. The united front and the people's front against the brown hangmen and jailers represent the force which, relying upon solidarity of the toilers of the whole world, will secure the discontinuance of any further death sentences, the abolition of concentration camps, general amnesty for all imprisoned opponents of Hitler, the release of Thaelmann, Mirendorff, Ossietsky and all arrested anti-fascists, and discontinuance of the torturing of anti-fascists, freedom of defense and the right to select counsel, and human treatment of prisoners. And this means the struggle to abolish fascist barbarity.

* * *

In the opinion of the bloody fascist judges, "the time has gone forever" when it was possible to fight for communism in Germany. You're wrong, gentlemen: you cannot give the people bread, or freedom, but only hunger, terror and war. You have shed a sea of blood. But the result of this is only that the flame of mass indignation is mounting higher. "The proletariat will avenge my death"—these were the last words of Claus, spoken by him to the fascist Public Prosecutor. Aye, the proletariat will avenge Claus and thousands of other murdered anti-fascist fighters by overthrowing the bloody fascist dictatorship, which is a disgrace to the German people.

Rudolph Claus in his last words to the fascist judges, two Reichswehr Generals and two leaders of the brown gangs, said:

"I shall not dispute with you about justice. I have never done anything to harm the working class and have proved more than once that I am not afraid of death. You can kill me, but even your hangmen cannot help you to retard the victory of the revolution."

The cause for which Comrade Rudolph Claus has died, for which thousands of German Communists are fighting, will be victorious throughout the whole world.

The Stakhanov Movement and Our Enemies

By A. RUBINES

THE Stakhanov movement is a new and higher stage of socialist competition, a stage connected with the development of new technique; it is a mass communist movement for a higher productivity of labor, "which will go down as one of the most glorious pages in the history of our socialist construction" (Stalin).

Our great Stalin, the genius and leader of the international proletariat, in his speech at the first All-Union Conference of Stakhanov Workers said that the Stakhanov movement "opens up before us the road upon which alone those higher indices of labor productivity can be achieved which are essential to the transition from socialism to communism and to the elimination of the difference between mental and physical labor" (Stalin).

This magnificent movement of people of a new epoch—of working men and women, of men and women collective farmers of the Soviet Union, who are surpassing the present technical standards and the existing planned capacities—opens up inexhaustible reserves in industry, transport and agriculture, and "is destined to cause a revolution in our industry" (Stalin). The Stakhanov movement is accelerating the construction of classless socialist society, is increasing the power of the Soviet Union, and consolidating the position of socialism throughout the world.

The Stakhanov movement declares a struggle against present-day capitalism which dooms hundreds of millions of people to unemployment, want, hunger, and slow death. The Stakhanov movement is a new deadly weapon of socialism in its struggle against capitalism, the weapon of a higher productivity of labor. It is a deadly weapon as far as the old world is concerned, because in the historic struggle between systems that system wins which bears with it a higher productivity of labor, which brings mankind greater victories in its struggle against nature. "In the long run, productivity of labor is the chief, the most important thing for the victory of the new social system" (Lenin).

Born in one of the pits in the Donetz Coal Basin, at the coal face worked by Stakhanov, this movement spread like a whirlwind throughout the Soviet Union, embracing all branches of industry, all spheres of socialist construction.

The victory of the Stakhanov heroes, the victory of socialist productivity of labor, has focused the attention of international public opinion, both proletarian and bourgeois. The names of the modest working men and women, the Stakhanov workers—Stakhanov, Busygina, Smetanin, Krivonos, Dusia and Maria Vinogradova, and others are

world famous. They are known everywhere, they are known not only in the Land of Soviets, where labor is held in the greatest honor, they are known also in the lands of capital, where labor is a heavy, shameful burden which oppresses millions of the exploited toilers.

The magnificent heroic struggle of the new Soviet people for a high productivity of labor, for a cultured and prosperous life cannot be ignored. Even the capitalist press cannot keep silent about this movement.

A number of capitalist newspapers have been compelled to admit the fact that the Stakhanov movement is really a movement of the toiling masses themselves.

The French *Le Temps* (November 12, 1935), writes:

"In the course of six weeks, the effort made by the miner Stakhanov has become a mighty movement embracing the whole of the working class.

"The present movement," the paper continues, "is the more convincing in that it has its source in the personal initiative of the Soviet workers, and is not a more or less severe administrative measure, and it shows that the Soviet workers are capable or will soon become capable of competing with their Western comrades."

Some bourgeois journalists are trying to interpret the Stakhanov movement to suit themselves, to prove it is possible also under capitalism. Thus the *Manchester Guardian* of November 28, 1935, assures its readers that a movement like the Stakhanov movement can take place not only under socialism but also under capitalism. It writes:

"The motives are the same, although one may be striving toward the socialist, and the others towards the capitalist order."

But the whole point is that the motives, the desires, and the essence are all different. The Stakhanov movement was born of the magnificent victories of socialism. The conditions for its rise and development were created by a number of factors, including the persistent work carried on by the Party and the Soviet state to improve the material conditions of the workers and the masses of collective farmers, and to raise their cultural and technical level as well as their political consciousness and activity. These factors are as follows: The heroic struggle of the working class during the years of the First Five-Year Plan to set up their own powerful socialist heavy industry; the struggle for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture; the victory of the collective farming system in the rural districts (90 per cent of the peasant farms have joined the collective farms), and the liquidation of the last capitalist class, the kulaks, and of the remains of the exploiting classes. The Stakhanov movement grew up in the period when the national economy of the U.S.S.R. "has become completely socialist economy" (Molotov, report at the second session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R., January 10, 1936), and socialist economy has acquired a concise, confident rhythm, when "life has become better, and more joyous".

Under capitalism there is not, and cannot be, any movement like the Stakhanov movement, *i.e.*, a mass movement of the people prepared for by the whole development of the proletarian revolution, and coming from below, embracing the whole of the manifold processes of human labor, and causing a revolution in it.

It is enough to call to mind the great, wise words of Comrade Stalin about the roots of the Stakhanov movement, to understand all the fallacy of making any attempts to transplant this movement to capitalist soil. These roots are the improvement of the material conditions of the toilers in the U.S.S.R., the absence of exploitation in the Land of Soviets, the existence of new technique, and the presence of new people who have mastered this technique. These will not take root on capitalist soil, for capitalism means hunger, unemployment, exploitation, wage reductions, destruction of productive forces, imperialist wars and fascist savagery.

Only in the U.S.S.R., where the proletarian revolution has destroyed once and for all the power of the landlords and capitalists, and has given the toilers not only freedom, but *material benefits*, and the opportunity of living prosperous and cultured lives, without having to worry about their daily bread, could the Stakhanov movement originate.

"To be able to live well and joyfully it is necessary that material benefits should be added to the benefits of political liberty." (Stalin.)

Wages are increasing in the U.S.S.R. from year to year. Thus, the wages of workers employed in large-scale industry amounted at the end of 1935 to 282.5 per cent of the corresponding figure for 1928.

Retail prices of industrial and agricultural products are steadily declining. Thus, during the years 1933-35, retail prices on the open market dropped as follows: rye bread by two-thirds, wheat bread by 60 per cent, sugar, two-thirds, meat, 50 per cent, animal fats, 60 per cent, etc.

The government expenditure on the cultural requirements of the toilers has increased tremendously. While the appropriation for this purpose in 1926 amounted to 939,000,000 rubles, the corresponding expenditure for 1935 reached the sum of 7,600,000,000 rubles. The *real wages* of the workers are increasing month by month, the workers and collective farmers are becoming increasingly prosperous, their material well-being and cultural level are improving. The production of articles of general consumption rose to a value of 28,700,000,000 rubles in 1935. The food industry has taken a tremendous step forward; the amount of agricultural products available for sale on the market has increased. The trade turnover in 1935 rose to a total of 80,500,000,000 rubles, as against 61,800,000,000 rubles in 1934.

Does not all this testify to the sturdy growth of the material well-being of the workers and collective farmers in the U.S.S.R.? A cheerful and happy outlook, an enthusiasm for creative activity, and gaiety have arisen among the masses out of the material security of the toilers of the Soviet Union, the freedom from worry about the morrow—for

there is no unemployment and there will be none in the U.S.S.R.—the tremendous rise of socialist consciousness as a result of the broad, mass, propagandist work of the Party, and widely developed Soviet democracy.

"And when one lives joyfully, work hums. Hence the high standard of output." (Stalin.)

It is only in the U.S.S.R., where the toilers are working, not to enrich a handful of capitalist exploiters, but for themselves, for their own toiling people that the Stakhanov movement could originate and spread. Only in the U.S.S.R. does the sturdy growth of productivity

". . . lead without fail to an extension of the front of production, to an increase in the number of lathes and production aggregates at work, to a rise in the number of workers employed, to a rise in their wages. For the Soviet system, which has liberated the productive forces from their capitalist fetters, cannot but lead to their all-round development." (From the resolution of the December Plenary Session of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.)

With the further increase in the productivity of labor and the development of technique, the proletarian state will, of course, not take the road of dismissing workers, but will take the other road of further shortening the working day. Is such a perspective possible under capitalism?

In the U.S.S.R. the stormy increase in production as a result of the widespread adoption of Stakhanov methods of work and the development of the Stakhanov movement is leading to an abundance of products, to further reductions in prices, to still greater improvements in the material well-being of the masses. But under capitalism? Can we say that the bourgeoisie is interested in a stormy increase in production? Under capitalist conditions, this leads to overproduction and crisis. The bourgeoisie, as we know, is interested in selling its commodities at monopoly prices. Neither is the worker, of course, interested in an increase in the productivity of labor under capitalist conditions, for it leads in the long run to increased unemployment and wage reductions.

That is why the painful efforts of the *Manchester Guardian* to convince anybody of the possibility of "applying" the Stakhanov movement under capitalist conditions are in vain.

The Social-Democratic press, too, cannot remain silent about the Stakhanov movement. Many Right Social-Democratic leaders, many muddleheads from among the ranks of Left Social-Democracy, and the Trotskyites who have long ago sunk down to the camp of the counter-revolution, are helping the bourgeoisie to bespatter the Stakhanov movement and invent all sorts of "arguments" against it. The Belgian *Le Peuple*, official organ of Belgian Social-Democracy, published an article by A. Habaru on November 30, 1935, which contained the following statement:

"We think that the motives which inspired the Stakhanov movement were of a purely individualistic character. . . . The

Stakhanov movement comprises non-socialist elements. The effort to raise the well-being of the individual and, to say all there is to say, the desire for gain and the thirst for official distinction is just as much in evidence as the desire to serve the 'Socialist Fatherland'."

Habaru, the renegade and Trotskyite, goes still further in the same newspaper, in its issue of January 6, 1936, and calls the Stakhanov movement anti-socialist because the "Stakhanov workers stand in the ranks of the privileged caste" (!?). It is perfectly natural that the renegade (that is his business as a renegade) will leave no stone unturned to heap calumny on the Stakhanov movement and the Land of Soviets where it originated!

But the arguments of such "theoreticians" as Habaru are so bankrupt that not much effort is required to make every worker understand that only class enemies can write as Habaru writes.

What sort of privileged caste is this about? The proletarian revolution in the U.S.S.R. has destroyed all castes once and for all. Will Habaru, the counter-revolutionary, and his adherents kindly name any other country in the world outside of the U.S.S.R., where all castes whatsoever have been utterly destroyed once and for all? As for those elements in the Stakhanov movement which Habaru refers to as non-socialist, every Marxist-Leninist knows that under socialism the toilers work according to their ability and receive wages according to the amount of work they do for society. Only under communism—the highest stage of socialism—will every member of society work according to his ability and receive according to his needs.

The Stakhanov workers are masters of high labor productivity, who more than fulfil all existing standards of output and consequently earn considerably more than others. They naturally live better. Is it in this that the "theoreticians" of *Le Peuple* see a "privileged caste"? But the land of socialism differs from capitalist countries in precisely this, that every honest toiler in the U.S.S.R. can raise his productivity of labor and become a Stakhanovite and so increase his wages. What is more, in the U.S.S.R. as we know, the Stakhanov workers are honored and respected, they are glorious heroes of labor. Does this mean, in the language of the renegade, to become one of a privileged caste?

It has never occurred to Habaru that in the U.S.S.R. life is full of the joy of creation, that labor, from being the shameful, heavy burden it was formerly considered, has become "a thing of honor, glory, valor and heroism" (Stalin).

What causes the workers of the Soviet Union to stand in the front ranks of those who fight for a rise in the productivity of labor?

We have before us a simple, clear picture, drawn by Comrade Chemedurov, a famous Stakhanov worker from Krivorozh, about the stimulus which inspired him to become a Stakhanovite.

He came to the mine in 1925, an illiterate, dirty, backward peasant. "The whole aim of my life was to earn enough to deck myself out in leather top-boots and breeches of real broadcloth. Straw sandals spoiled my life," he relates. "I liked to work, without understanding that it

was necessary for the state, for the workers. I thought of one thing alone, that I must earn money." Very soon Comrade Chemodurov began to wear top-boots, breeches, and a fashionable shirt. But little by little the turbulent industrial life got a hold upon Chemodurov. "I began to understand, for example, that one must not pour out any amount of machine oil, because the oil is *ours*, that one musn't throw the hammer down anywhere. And suddenly I became 'plan-conscious', I began to be interested in the amount of ore that mine ought to give, how my comrades were working." (See *Za Industrializatsia*, December 24, 1935).

This is how the new man of socialist labor is born. Lenin wrote, as far back as 1919:

"Communism begins where ordinary workers, through self-sacrificing onerous labor, begin to strive for greater productivity of labor, for safeguarding every pound of grain, of coal, of iron and other products, in the interests, not of these workers themselves . . . but . . . of the whole of society. . . ." (*The Great Initiative*.)

Seized with alarm and fury at the new factor in the victory of socialism, the capitalist press wants to render the Stakhanov movement harmless in the eyes of the toilers of the capitalist countries, by frightening them at the development of technique. The newspapers are spreading the idea of the Stakhanov movement as the "worship of technique". The bourgeois "theoreticians" who scare the workers with the idea that machinery creates unemployment transfer their own thoughts onto soil which is absolutely alien to them.

In order to catch some of the intellectuals who believe in the "mysterious nature" of the soul of the Russian people, a solid dose of a mystical and obscure fog is put forward.

The Swiss *Neue Zurich Zeitung* displays particular inventiveness in this direction. Literally panting with fury and anger, this newspaper published on October 24, 1935, the following comment written by a Russian whiteguard under the pseudonym W. J.:

"The Soviet Union is seeking support in a new mysticism, the mysticism of the 'Stakhanov movement'. These new methods of work, which according to certain specialists, while including certain sensible innovations, nevertheless on the whole easily lead to the exhaustion of labor power and to the wearing out of the machines and may end in burying all the achievements of industry, gave rise to a state of intoxication which the Soviet Union has given itself up to at the present moment, inspired as it is by official propaganda on all sides. There is a flourishing sports fever in Russia, which is raging more than ever before. The indifference and carelessness which existed up to quite recently are giving way to a downright religious mania. The Russian people are quickly fired, and have an everlasting belief in miracles."

We shall not dwell upon the prophesies made by this homebred prophet. It is worth remembering that the "mysticism" of the Soviet

Union consists of the fact that the Stakhanov movement marks an unprecedented blossoming forth of the productivity of labor, a tremendous growth of the technical and ideological level of the working class, which enables it to overthrow all the "technically justified standards" the *only "justification"* for which was the former backwardness of the Russian working class. This "mysticism" consists of the fact that as a result of the Stakhanov movement, and the socialist competition, shock work and striving for high quality which paved the way for the Stakhanov movement, the Second Five-Year Plan will be fulfilled in a number of industries in four years and the Krivorozh Basin has already fulfilled it in three years. This "mysticism" consists of the fact that the direct result of the Stakhanov methods of work was the over-fulfilment of the 1935 plan, the third year of the Second Five-Year Plan, by 9.7 per cent in the heavy industry, 11.8 per cent in the food industry, 16 per cent in railroad transport, etc.

This "mysticism" also consists of the fact that the Stakhanov workers have mastered the slogan of their great teacher and leader, Comrade Stalin, namely that "cadres who have mastered technique decide everything". They studied stubbornly, passing their examinations with marks of "excellent". The "excellent" industrial studies of the shock workers of Soviet factories and of the socialist fields led them to criticize and overthrow the "technically justified standards", which up to then had seemed some sort of inviolable fundamentals of industrial life. Almost all the Stakhanov workers have passed the state technical examination at "excellent", mastered technique, and put it to the service of their working class state, once and for all discarding the notorious Russian backwardness inherited from the past. In the heavy industry, 797,000 workers have passed the state technical examinations, and out of their ranks they have advanced thousands and thousands of present-day Stakhanov workers.

The December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. recognized it to be essential that

"... minimum technical instruction must be made universal and compulsory for all working men and women, and this highly important activity must be made to serve the aim of raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to that of the engineers and technicians."

The network of educational courses in industry, transport and agriculture will cover 7,860,000 people in 1936, as against 5,540,000 in 1935. In industry, transport and communications, 3,040,000 people will sit for their compulsory technical minimum examination this year. Thus, conditions are being created for drawing ever more workers into the ranks of the Stakhanov fighters for higher productivity of labor, for lower costs of production, and for higher quality production.

These measures are also preparing the conditions for destroying the age-long disparity between physical and mental labor. And it is difficult to imagine the "wonders" that the productive power of human labor will produce when tens of millions of workers and collective farm-

ers are inspired with knowledge and the creative force of the brain.

Only in the U.S.S.R. do we see man being transformed from the automaton, the slave of the machine, which he is under capitalism, into the master of the machine. Only in the U.S.S.R. have tremendous possibilities been created for inventiveness on the part of the worker, for a rise in the cultural and technical level of the toilers hitherto unseen anywhere. Only under socialism are forms of labor created (socialist competition, shock work, and the Stakhanov movement) which contain a high level of culture and consciousness, self-sacrificing loyalty to the working class cause, and a rise in the creative power and initiative of the workers, which are thereby the guarantee of the elimination of the contrast between manual and mental labor.

"The elimination of the contrast between mental labor and manual labor," said Stalin at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, "can be achieved only by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineers and technical workers."

This unity of mental and manual labor is already so definitely outlined in the Stakhanov movement that it is immediately being noticed by those workers who have hardly ever heard of such a difficult and complicated problem as the contrast between mental and manual labor. "I want to say about the Stakhanov workers", said Andrianov, a plasterer from the town of Gorky, "that I like this business because it is not a question of strength, but brains" (*Za Industrializatsia*, December 10, 1935).

Comrade Murashko, a Donetz miner, expressed the same idea in the following words: "We are making the machines work for us, and are not becoming the slaves of the machines."

These simple words indicate a new approach to technique. They indicate the abolition of the conditions under which man is the slave of the machine, and new principles in the organization of labor.

Neither are we scared of the "wearing out of the machines" prophesied by the oracles from the *Neue Zuricher Zeitung*. The U.S.S.R. is not afraid of "the machines wearing out", if they are used rationally and carefully. In the U.S.S.R. there is no problem of "moral amortization". The Stakhanov workers are just the people who, although they do not "worship technique", nevertheless take care of the machine and use it rationally and carefully, thus guaranteeing the machine a maximum term for its amortization.

The "theoretician" from the *Neue Zuricher Zeitung* is afraid not only that the machines will rapidly wear away; he predicts the rapid exhaustion of the workers. He is not at all original in his sudden "solicitude for the people". The "humanitarians" of many bourgeois newspapers are practising compositions on this theme in many keys. The "sports fever", the "record-making", the "perfected Taylor system", the "sweating system"—all these variations are played with boring monotony on the pages of a multitude of bourgeois and Social-Democratic newspapers. The *Neue Zuricher Zeitung*, in a leading article entitled

"The Russian Illusion of Records", in the issue of November 29, 1935, howls out as follows:

"A paroxysm has seized the whole of Russia. . . . Russia has never before experienced such intoxication. Such convulsions are of an unhealthy character, and it is difficult to imagine what an awful awakening will follow the fantastic dream through which the majority of the Russian youth are passing today."

The fascist *Voelkischer Beobachter* of November 25, 1935, sees in the Stakhanov movement an attempt to raise the productivity of labor in the U.S.S.R. by "an extreme intensification of the Taylor system".

"To this end," the paper writes, "a number of workers with athletic bodies are chosen, who in extremely favorable conditions produce a doubled, and trebled output; the demand has been put forward that all the other workers follow their example."

The Austrian *Neue Freie Presse* of November 12, 1935, gives its readers a short note. "The principle (of Stakhanov work) is very simple. It is the same Taylor method, only the division of labor is still more perfected."

The Austrian governmental *Reichspost* of November 30, 1935, gives the following short "estimate" of Comrade Stakhanov: "He is a Ukrainian worker who, because of his extraordinary physical strength, attains a high productivity of labor."

And Otto Bauer, who spares no words to laud to the utmost the Stakhanov movement and its results, regrets that "the possibility is not excluded" that there would be a further extreme exploitation of the workers in Soviet works. "Fears" in this direction inspire him once again to put forward for the U.S.S.R. the notorious Menshevik slogan of making the trade unions independent from, and neutral towards, the proletarian state.

And the bourgeois newspapers most of all portend over-production and unemployment following on the growth of production, in consequence of the Stakhanov movement.

The workers of the U.S.S.R. have heard about over-production and crisis more than once already. The hardened counter-revolutionary Trotsky threatened them with this. The reply to these threats are the figures and facts of the growth of the economic might and the rise in the well-being of the broad masses of the Soviet Union. The gigantic program of industry and agriculture, the improvement in the material level of the toilers in 1936, are the best proof of the fact that there can be no menace of over-production and crises in the U.S.S.R. The industrial output for 1936 will amount to 81,000,000,000 rubles. The total volume of capital construction throughout national economy will amount to 32,365,000,000 rubles. Agriculture in 1936 will give 6,300,000,000 poods of grain. The socialist village will receive agricultural machinery to the value of several thousand million rubles, 60,000 new combines and ten of thousands of new tractors. The gross production of the whole of industry will increase by 23 per cent as against the 1935

figure. According to the 1936 plan, the national income will increase by 26.5 per cent and will amount to 83,100,000,000 rubles. In 1936, eight billion rubles are assigned to construction in the field of cultural and housing requirements. The social insurance budget will also rise to 8,000,000,000 rubles. The wages fund will be 63,400,000,000 rubles as against 56,200,000,000 in 1935. The average wages of the workers and office employees, etc., will increase by 8.5 per cent. All these figures will be translated into life; the Stakhanov movement makes this a certainty.

The "sports" version of the Stakhanov movement is the favorite analogy in the capitalist press. The Stakhanov movement is presented as a variety of record-making in the sphere of sport.

But "record-making" in the U.S.S.R., which embraces millions of people and results in a general improvement in the productivity of labor in whole branches of national economy, can hardly be characterized in this fashion; at any rate, it does not resemble the "record-making" about which the capitalist press is howling.

This is what the workers themselves have to say about their "record-making":

"We are not recordsmen or sportsmen," declared Bobylev, a welder, at the Stakhanov conference. "We have tested our open-hearth furnace, taken the business in hand, performed repairs, and asked the furnace how much it can turn out. It replied, 11.33 per cent."

The secret of the Stakhanov "record-making" lies in this careful, businesslike study of the production process. The Stakhanov records would have remained records if, as Stakhanov himself said, "practical conclusions had not been drawn from them immediately for use on every section, throughout the whole mine", for all branches of industry, throughout the whole country.

There is already not a single branch of national economy that cannot boast of its Stakhanovites. The Stakhanovites make no secret of their methods. They teach them to their comrades in the factory, they make them the property of all the people, telling of their working experiences at conferences, over the wireless, in the newspapers, etc.

They meet every new Stakhanov who surpasses their records with joy and pride. Zadokhin, a plasterer, passes on his method of work to other brigades. "And I must say," said he, "they have begun to work as well as I do. This pleases me. It is good to feel that a young generation of Stakhanov plasterers is growing up at your side." (See *Lekhkaya Industria*, December 12, 1935.)

Busygin, a smith in the Gorky automobile works, is tremendously energetic and enthusiastic about teaching his comrades to master the new methods of work, and is pleased when one or other of the Stakhanov workers produces a good output: "I look at it this way . . . that a true Stakhanov worker is one who not only cares for his own records but is prepared to help his comrade with every sort of advice, who is pleased not only at his own success but at the success of the whole of his

department, the whole of his works." (Speech at the Conference of Stakhanov workers.)

Krivonos, an engine-driver (outstanding Stakhanovite on the railroads), not only drives his engine at a high speed himself, but persuades the other engine-drivers to follow his example. "I began to prove that driving in this way gives good results and that we can really use the locomotives to better advantage." (Speech at the Conference of Stakhanov workers.)

Under capitalism, the recordsmen do not talk about their secrets. But the Stakhanovites teach them to everyone who wants to learn.

And if we take a look at the Stakhanov records in the light of the fact that they are not isolated instances, but are the highest results of the broad movement of the toiling masses in the Union for a higher productivity of labor, then these records, as compared with the standards of the foremost factories in capitalist countries, will stand out before us in all their fatal significance for the capitalist system.

COMPARISON BETWEEN RECORDS BY STAKHANOVITES AND WORLD STANDARDS

<i>Specificity or nature of article produced. Name of Stakhanovite and place of work.</i>	<i>Unit of measure</i>	<i>Standard of output or record output abroad</i>	<i>Record out- put in the U.S.S.R.</i>
Milling machine operator (for milling machines), Gudov, Ordjonikidze Works, Moscow.	one detail	standard—50 an hour (Germany)	200 per hour
Operator (work on bloom- ing), Ogorodnikov, Magnitogorsk mill.	ingots	standard—200 per shift	240 per shift
Electrolysis workers, Filchenok and Gerasimov, Volkhov works.	baths	8 (in France)	10 per shift
Electro-welders Vysotsky, Engineering Works in Gorlovsk, (Ukraine).	joints on the body of wa- gonettes, in meters.	latest world record—98	126 per shift
Hubs, Busygina, Gorky Auto works	Units per hour	60 (in (U.S.A.))	90 per shift
Steelmaker (duplex process), Liutov, Yenakievsk works.	Steel taken per sq. meter of hearth in tons	7.6, average standard in Germany	21 tons
Shoeworker, Smetanin	Pairs of boots.	1125 per shift, at the Batya factory (Czecho- slovakia)	1,860 per shift
Cotton Weavers, the Vinogradovas.	Number of automatic looms tended	90-100	144 looms

As can be seen from the above table, the foremost workers in the Soviet Union not only equal, but exceed the standards of the foremost capitalist enterprises.

Such high results have as yet only been obtained by Stakhanovites, although their number is already sufficiently imposing. Thus, for example, the average proportion of Stakhanovites to the total number of workers employed at the Stalin works (Leningrad Region), amounted to 12 per cent in December, 1935, and at the Vorovsky works to 16.8 per cent, etc.

In certain departments, the number of Stakhanovites reached 30 per cent and more of the total workers employed there. Stakhanovite records exert a tremendous influence upon the masses of the workers, and have called forth a new upsurge of socialist competition. Stakhanovite days and Stakhanovite weeks are being organized in many factories. Some factories are getting ready for Stakhanovite months. At the Electrostal works (Moscow region), January 5 was made a Stakhanov day. On that day the works as a whole produced 577.2 tons of steel —148 per cent of the plan. The foundry of the Red October works in Stalingrad attained the following results on Stakhanov day (January 4): the standards for iron castings was fulfilled 275 per cent; for special steel, 437 per cent, etc. The Stakhanov week at the Ordjonikidze works finished brilliantly. The assembly department fulfilled the standard by 225 per cent, the second mechanical department by 204 per cent. A Stakhanovite month began on January 6.

The number of workers who exceed the standard of output is growing in all factories. Below we give data for only two factories, the Makayev works (Ukraine), the production of which (iron smelting) for 1935 alone, was equal to the total iron-smelting of Poland and Italy taken together, and the Sverdlov pipe works.

MAKAYEV WORKS (*metallurgy*)

	<i>Average for plant</i>				
Fulfilment of standard, in percentages	125	125-50	150-200	200-300	12.7
Number of workers involved	5,834	3,054	840	178	
Increase in earnings, in percentages	18	36	67	137	

SVERDLOVSK PIPE WORKS

	<i>Over</i>				
	150-200	200-250	250-300	300-400	400
Fulfilment of standard, in percentages					
Number of workers involved	512	250	24	23	28
Average daily wage, in rubles	12.50	17.50	22.40	29.80	40.30

The figures for these as well as for other enterprises show the tremendous over-fulfilment of the norm which is evident in socialist fac-

tories. These figures also show that the fulfilment and overfulfilment of the norm bring in their train a tremendous increase in wages.

The tremendous over-fulfilment of the standards by some Stakhanovites, reaching 1,000 per cent, is evidence of the fact that the standards of output which are the basis for calculating wages are already ridiculously low for the new worker. They no longer conform to the new technique or the organization of labor, or the new real capacity of the equipment, discovered by the Stakhanov workers. Thus, the locomotive construction works at Lugansk can put out two thousand locomotives annually instead of one thousand, now that the Stakhanov methods of work have been introduced. Our tractor works, in Kharkov and Stalingrad, instead of an output of 144 machines in two shifts, can produce 200 machines in one shift. What truly gigantic perspectives are opening up before the U.S.S.R.! The old norms do not reflect the new high technical level to which socialist industry has risen.

Thanks to the growth of the Stakhanov movement, the cost of production is steadily falling, i.e., the expenditure per unit of production is decreasing. In order that a further struggle may be waged to lower the cost of production, the output standards must be revised. They must give a reduction in prices which "is the most correct and real way of raising the wages of the workers". (Speech of Comrade Mikoyan at the December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.)

This is why the December Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. decided that

"... the present technical standards, which are now antiquated, must be replaced by higher technical standards ... provided, however, that where progressive piece rates are paid, the present scales are preserved* and the total payroll increased in view of the growth of the Stakhanov movement."

This signifies that the standards must be made to conform with the new, tested, industrial possibilities of the lathe, the aggregate of machinery in the works. The whole work and responsibility of rate-fixing will be laid, not upon unskilled rate-fixers, as was the practice formerly, but upon the engineering and technical staff of the works or factory under the direct supervision of the director of the enterprise. Stakhanovites will be drawn into the work of fixing the new standards of output in the enterprises. Side by side with a certain increase in the standard of output, the decisions of the plenary meeting of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. provide for such an organization of wages as will in the future ensure a rise in the wages and stimulate the growth of the productivity of labor, *as in the case of progressive piece rates the present scales are preserved*. In what capitalist country is an increase in the standard of output possible without a reduction in the existing scales, without a reduction in wages?

In this connection, it is not without interest to call to mind the prophecies of the Conservative *Morning Post*, which it shouted to the

* That is, the rate of progressive increase in payment for output beyond the basic output required, is to be preserved.

world over a year ago, on September 23, 1934. Denying the possibility of any technical development in the U.S.S.R. this paper professorially let fall the following "truths":

"The Russians are not a technically-minded people. Since they spring from a long chain of land cultivators, it cannot be assumed that in five years they will learn the art of making different parts of machinery with the precision of one-thousandth part of an inch."

Selecting individual cases of disorder in Soviet enterprises reported in the Soviet press, the newspaper maliciously published the following "sensational" item:

"Late in the spring of this year, a big combine of American type was sent by a certain Soviet factory to one of the Ukrainian collective farms. However, there was not a single person on the collective farm who had ever seen such a machine in his life. And so all attempts to set the combine in motion met with no results."

A year later, despite their "agricultural genealogy" and their not being "technically minded," the people of the U.S.S.R. managed to leave far behind the standards of output not only of the English people, but also of the Americans. With an American standard of 231 hectares per combine, the combine operators of the Soviet machine and tractor stations covered an average per combine of 267 hectares. Moreover, individual operators, presumably the more "incapable representatives of the Russian people", have covered up to 1,600 hectares per combine.

However, perhaps all these hundreds and thousands of masters of socialist labor are really people who are unusually healthy and possess phenomenal physical strength?

Of course, the Soviet people are the healthiest people in the world. This cannot be denied.

On the basis of the uninterrupted increase in the material and cultural standards of the Soviet toilers, the death rate in the U.S.S.R. is steadily declining from year to year, and the birth rate is equally steadily growing.

This process began at the end of the civil war and intervention, and during the 13 years which have passed since then the death rate in the U.S.S.R. has fallen by 44 per cent. The increase in the population in industrial centers is 3 to 5 times higher than in the cities in capitalist countries. Tsarist Russia occupied one of the first places in the world for its high death rate. The U.S.S.R. has acceded this priority to the old world.

Nevertheless, the Stakhanovites are people with normal bodies, improved, it is true, on Soviet lines. In order to perform their work they do not have to use up even the excess of health which they possess thanks to the steadily improving conditions under which they live. What is more, by rationalizing the labor process, by placing people in their right working places, and perfecting the technology of production, they

are striving after a smaller expenditure of strength than under the old methods of work. Comrade Smetanin, a Stakhanovite in the Leningrad shoe factory "Skorohod" who gives the highest productivity in the world for binding boots, emphasizes this circumstance in his speech.

"Physical over-exertion?" he asks, and thereupon replies: "In my work the most important thing is regular rhythm, pace. If you lose the pace, and then hurry, you're lost. I have said more than once, and repeat it again here, that I turned out 1,400 pairs of shoes not by over-exertion, but by carefully studying the operation."

"My movements," says Zharova, a bricklayer, "are strictly calculated, confident,—and despite the fact that I lay twice as many bricks now, I get less tired."

The smithy of the Gorky auto works, which trained Comrade Bulygin, is famous throughout the world for its productivity. However, there also this increased productivity is accompanied by less tiredness on the part of the workers.

"Before, the heavy slags lay on the floor. The worker [the smith, A.R.] had to bend down and pick them up. Now a table support has been made, the slabs are laid on it, and so the worker is freed from this tiring movement."

All the talk about Taylorism in the capitalist press is refuted by millions of statements by the workers themselves.

While the Stakhanov movement reveals a particularly full picture of the peculiarities of the Soviet Socialist system, Taylorism particularly clearly reveals the peculiarities of decaying monopoly capitalism. The Taylor system, like the Bedeaux system, signifies the emptiness of labor, the complete conversion of the worker into an appendage of the machine; Taylorism means the abolition and de-qualification of qualified (skilled) labor power, it means the most complete separation of mental labor from manual.

According to Taylor, "the ideal worker is dull and phlegmatic, and in character is more like a bullock than anything else."*

The Stakhanov movement means the growth of the scientific culture of labor. The Stakhanov movement means mental activity, initiative on the part of the worker, his ever growing industrial skill. The Stakhanov movement means the process of eliminating the distinction between mental and manual labor.

The Stakhanov movement is a new sharpening of the situation on the front of the class struggle. It is a new victory for socialism over the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the consciousness of people. The struggle and the victories of the Stakhanov productivity of labor sharpen the class hatred of the enemies of the working class with fresh force.

The Stakhanov movement will have a tremendous influence upon the revolutionary process going on among the working masses throughout the whole world. Is it surprising, therefore, that the pages of the fascist newspapers are full of evil calumnies against the U.S.S.R.?

* Taylor, *Scientific Organization of Labor*.

We knew and know that every victory for socialism is accompanied by an acute class struggle, and nobody can accuse us of underestimating this factor.

Fascism is deepening the contradictions of capitalism, and suffocating in these contradictions. For the three years that it has been in power in Germany, fascism has given the proletariat and the toiling peasantry nothing but privations, terror, tortures, dungeons and prisons. All political liberties have been taken away. Even the reformist trade unions have been suppressed. The intensification of labor is increasing, women are being thrown out of industry, and real wages are falling. The best working class fighters are perishing in prisons and dying under the tortures of the Hitler executioners.

The U.S.S.R. has entered the year 1936 with a tremendous rallying of the forces of the people around the Party and around our great Stalin. The year 1935 is particularly characteristic in that millions of the masses of the people are really feeling the results of the victories of socialism.

The U.S.S.R. has taken the road to real abundance, the road to new and mighty victories.

In Memoriam—Comrade Shapurji Saklatvala

TELEGRAM TO LONDON

*Editorial Board, Daily Worker;
Pollitt:*

Communist International lowers its fighting banner over the coffin of Comrade Saklatvala, worthy son of the Indian people, true friend of the working class and tireless fighter in the cause of socialism.

G. DIMITROFF.

SHAPURJI SAKLATVALA

By HARRY POLLITT

BY the death of Comrade Saklatvala, the Indian people have lost their greatest and most sincere champion, and the Communist Party one of its most devoted and self-sacrificing leaders.

The name of Shapurji Saklatvala was known and honored by the toiling masses the world over, and he will be mourned by millions of oppressed peoples, who appreciated his fight for their liberation and independence from the yoke of imperialism.

Never have the workers of Britain, and the workers and peasants of India especially, had a leader who did so much and who sacrificed himself so much to their service as Comrade Saklatvala.

His amazing vitality, his profound knowledge, his ready and comradely advice, his cultural attainments and his unrivaled abilities as an orator and exponent of the revolutionary principles of the Communist International, leave a wide gap in our ranks.

In very truth we can say of our beloved comrade:

“He died for the workers.
In life he was one whose
Love knew no stint, whom
No fear could appall.”

Only those who have known him intimately can form any idea of the work that he did.

Night after night, year after year, in all parts of Britain he carried out his task of working class agitation, education and organization.

Only those who also participate in this understand the ceaseless strain and anxiety it entails. No comrade ever did more of this work so uncomplainingly as Comrade Saklatvala.

No call was ever made upon him to which he did not respond. Be the meeting large or small, it was always the same. Be it near or far it was all the same.

Countless memories flood in upon me as I write. One, of our comrade in 1927, immediately comes to mind when he spoke at a meeting on the Sunday night in Edinburgh, took the night train to Crewe, motored to Ogmore in South Wales for a Miners' May Meeting in the morning, did a further meeting in Swansea at night and traveled all night, back to Battersea for a committee meeting on the Tuesday morning.

That was how he worked.

Saklatvala was 61 years of age. He was born in Bombay and educated at St. Xavier's College in that city. He studied law in England and was called to the Bar.

On arrival in England in 1905 he was persuaded to join the National Liberal Club, but a few months of its atmosphere was enough for him and when he left it he left the Liberal Party behind him forever.

A meeting with Lord Morley was sufficient to disillusion him with Liberal talk of its friendship for the Indian people.

By 1910 he had become one of the most active members of the Independent Labor Party; he was always striving inside the I.L.P. to combat the MacDonald-Snowden influence.

* * *

The great revolution in Russia in 1917 made a tremendous impression upon Shapurji Saklatvala and he became one of the foremost in popularizing its historic significance, and a leader in the People's Russian Information Bureau.

He also took an active part in the Left-wing group inside the I.L.P. which in 1919 began the political struggle for the I.L.P. to join the Communist International.

He came to the Communist Party in 1921 with other members of the I.L.P. and became at once a great force inside the Communist Party. Also, of course, this step of Saklatvala's had a tremendous significance throughout the Indian nationalist and revolutionary movements.

In 1922, although a Communist, he was elected Labor Member for North Battersea. He lost his seat in 1923, but regained it in 1924.

In 1929, he was faced with Labor opposition and was defeated.

In September, 1925, Saklatvala was to go to the United States as a member of the British Delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, but Mr. Kellogg, the Secretary of State, revoked his visa on the grounds that the United States did not admit revolutionaries.

For his activities during the general strike in May, 1926, he was given two months in jail.

In 1927, Saklatvala went to India and was given a reception by the masses wherever he went, such as falls to the lot of few men to get.

From India he wanted to go to Egypt, but was refused permission to do so, and on his return to England, the government revoked his permit to visit India again.

He—an Indian of whom all India was proud—was denied access to his own country.

Even the Labor government of 1929-31 refused to remove this out-

rageous ban on one whose life was dedicated to the cause of his people and the freedom of his country.

* * *

In 1934, Saklatvala again visited the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and was enthusiastically welcomed by the workers in Lenin-grad and Moscow.

But the proudest moments of his life, he recently told me, were those he spent in Turkestan, Kazakstan and Trans-Caucasia, where for weeks he was enthusiastically greeted by the toiling masses freed from the yoke of tsarism by the great proletarian revolution in Russia.

He saw the new industry, new collective agriculture, new culture and life, that free peoples can develop when once communism has given them their independence and emancipation.

"Oh, Harry, what my people could do in India," he said, "if only they were as free as my comrades in these autonomous republics of the U.S.S.R."

This experience seemed to give even Comrade Saklatvala a new and greater energy and impulse in all his later work.

He went with renewed enthusiasm into the struggle for Indian freedom and independence, for solidarity between British and Indian workers, and for unity among all those organizations in India that fight against British imperialism.

On the very day of his death he carried on this work. I know that all Thursday, and to within two hours of death claiming him he had been patiently trying to bring about unity between two groups of Indian comrades in London.

Shapurji Saklatvala was a symbol of the unity of the toiling masses of India and of the British working class against imperialism. In the Soviet Union, in the land of the freed nations, he felt that he was in his fatherland.

One could say that "Unity, unity alone can give our Indian people its freedom" were his last words.

* * *

Saklatvala has gone from our midst. Another soldier of the Revolution has passed on.

We lower our Red Banners before your closed eyes, dear Comrade Saklatvala, we pay tribute to all that you have done and taught us.

We are proud that you carried your early work to its logical conclusion by embracing and becoming a fearless exponent of the principles of the Communist International.

You have built better than you knew. Your work will go on.

We swear before your open grave that the Red Banner you held so proudly aloft, the hope and inspiration you gave to millions living in the darkness of imperialist slavery, shall be carried forward to other fights and victories.

We pledge ourselves that your unparalleled devotion and self-sacrifice shall be the example we will endeavor to emulate.

The great Indian people, the peasants of Punjab and of other provinces, the weavers of Bombay and Calcutta, the railroad, mine and plantation workers, their brothers in other dependent and colonial countries to whose struggle for freedom you devoted your life, bow their heads at your grave.

Today in the mining valleys of South Wales, the cotton towns of Lancashire, the shipyard centers of the Northeast Coast, and the factories and shipyards of Scotland, workers mourn and grieve for your passing.

But you will live again in the work that will follow. The workers of the world and the oppressed peoples will unite. They will break their chains.

They will build that new world of which you have been so mighty an architect.

The Stakhanov Movement As Dealt With by the Communist Press

By ROTOR

"The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. provides the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries with a mighty weapon for influencing the broad masses of the toilers. Our old methods of agitation and propaganda about the U.S.S.R. are now inadequate." (G. Manuilsky, "Report to the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.")

"In one part of the earth at least, all that we have been fighting for, for half a century, is now being put into practice. This gives me indescribable joy, although I cannot and shall not see it, because I am 70 years old already. But I can pass this on to others as something worth copying." (From a letter received from a Prague worker.)

OVER four months have passed since Stakhanov, a miner working in one of the pits in the Donetz Basin (the "Central Irmino" pit) cut 102 tons of coal in one shift during the night of September 1, the normal output being six to seven tons. As the *New York Times* put it, the world dictionary has been enriched by a new word—"Stakhanovism".

The words "Stakhanovism" and "Stakhanov methods" have become famous far beyond the confines of the first socialist state in the world. The Stakhanov movement, the movement of foremost working men and women to increase the productivity of labor, has spread like lightning throughout the whole of the enormous territory of the Soviet Union. The Stakhanov movement is the expression of a new upward drive, a higher stage of socialist competition. The Stakhanov movement ensures a gigantic growth of the productivity of labor, a tremendous growth of the material well-being of the people in the only country in the world where there are no parasitic classes and no exploitation, for which crises and unemployment hold no terrors, and where planned economy reigns. The Stakhanov movement must not be regarded as an ordinary mass movement of working men and women. "It is such a movement of working men and women which will go down as one of the most glorious pages in the history of our socialist construction." (Stalin.)

"As I understand it," writes a worker from Coblenz, Czechoslovakia, "the Stakhanov movement possesses a mighty force which accelerates the building of socialism, and which, thanks to the creation of even better living conditions, raises still higher the intellectual and moral level of every toiler."

"When I heard over the radio," writes a worker from Switzerland, "of the brilliant achievements of the Stakhanov workers, of their tasks and aims, I somehow felt particularly

clearly that the strength and ideals of the youth in capitalist countries are senselessly wasted, or are directed along a false road through fascist phraseology. . . . Dear comrades, your victories, your uninterrupted progress towards the classless society compensate us for the defeats which fascism and reaction have temporarily inflicted upon us."

These, and many other workers' letters published in the legal and illegal Communist press, workers' letters which come by diverse ways to the Soviet Union, testify to the tense attention with which the working class of the whole world is following the tremendous changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union, and the victorious march forward of the Stakhanov movement.

This is quite understandable, because the Stakhanov movement, being the result of the tense struggle of the Party, of the tremendous revolution which has taken place in the economic life and in the minds of the people during the years of victorious socialist construction, "is preparing the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism" (Stalin), to the communism which has long been the dream of the oppressed and exploited. Communism, as we know, represents a higher stage of development than socialism. Under communism each works according to his ability and receives according to his needs. Under communism the contrast between physical labor and mental labor will be destroyed, and the high productivity of labor will ensure an abundance of products. And we are living witnesses of these processes which are going on in the U.S.S.R. in connection with the development of the Stakhanov movement. The Stakhanov movement indicates a further increase in the wealth of the working class of the Soviet Union, a growth of abundance and a new cultural and technical advance among them. The rise in the cultural and technical level of the workers is one of the causes of the Stakhanov movement. It is one of the conditions also which will ensure it a further advance among the whole of the people.

The Stakhanov movement very convincingly demonstrates before the whole world the superiority of the socialist system on the question which is decisive for the victory of the new social order, namely, the question of the productivity of labor. The Stakhanov workers are masters of a high productivity of labor who have beaten world records, and are demonstrating to the whole of mankind that only under the conditions presented by the Soviet system, where there is no exploitation of man by man, is the ground assured for a rise in productivity of labor, for high wages and for a rise in the well-being of the toiling masses to a degree unparalleled in capitalist countries.

The Stakhanov movement which is a tremendous victory for socialism, a victory for the general line of the Leninist Party and its Stalinist Central Committee, has raised all the problems of socialism to a new, higher level. In this movement, many of the forecasts of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory have found their confirmation in practice for the first time. The Stakhanov movement makes it possible to give a clear picture to the broad masses throughout the world of the advan-

tages and the superiority of the socialist system, to raise all the problems connected with socialism before them. In our mighty struggle against capitalism, the Stakhanov movement provides us with a weapon of tremendous convincing force, as the great Lenin once pointed out in the following words:

"Today, we exert our main influence over the international revolution by our economic policy."

In this connection, the question arises as to how the legal and illegal press of our brother Communist Parties have been able to make use of this effective weapon, whether they have been able to present the Stakhanov movement as a new triumph of the proletarian revolution, whether they have successfully fulfilled the task set by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, namely:

". . . of appealing to wider sections of the toiling population, by showing them, on the basis of the concrete example of the U.S.S.R., what their fate will be under socialism." (Manuilsky.)

* * *

The Communist newspapers in capitalist countries have adopted a number of measures to popularize the success of the Stakhanov movement among the broad masses. To this end all our Party newspapers published the historic speech delivered by Comrade Stalin at the Conference of Stakhanov workers engaged in industry and transport. They published reports of the Stakhanov movement from their correspondents in the U.S.S.R., and telegrams and other brief items of information about Stakhanov workers and the Stakhanov movement, while a number of the papers published special articles explaining the character and importance of the Stakhanov movement.

L'Humanite, central organ of the Communist Party of France, commented on Comrade Stalin's speech in a number of leading articles, and especially emphasized the source and causes of the Stakhanov movement in the following way in an article on November 22:

"Why have the proletarians of the Soviet Union been able to raise their moral level, their intellectual and technical culture to such heights? Stalin explains this convincingly. Because the living conditions in the Soviet Union are improving daily; because wages are increasing, because nobody is afraid of unemployment, and everybody is sure of the morrow. Further, because the workers do not labor to enrich a parasitic class, but work for themselves, for their own future. And, finally, because the Soviet Union is now producing such cadres, such fine workers, as are capable of mastering the work of up-to-date technique."

The *Daily Worker*, central organ of the C.P. of Great Britain, also dealt with the historic importance of Stalin's speech at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanov workers of industry and transport:

"The victory of socialism, its superiority over capitalism, lies in the superiority of free socialist labor over capitalist slavery. . . . Socialist labor has shown itself capable of producing an abundance of goods, of creating prosperity, not for a limited class of exploiters, but for the whole of the people. Increased production, further mastering of the secrets of modern machine technique, will mean further progress. . . . The Stakhanov Conference and Stalin's speech are a great turning point in world history. For us, in Britain, where the miners, under-nourished, under-paid, suffering the scourge of unemployment, are entering into yet another great battle to win the right to live from their masters, the name of Stakhanov will also be a revolutionary inspiration."

The American *Daily Worker*, on November 10, printed an editorial:

"The Soviet Union has become the fortress of the proletariat and every victory of socialism in the Land of the Soviets is a big step forward in the direction of peace, of the defeat of fascism, of the emancipation of the workers from capitalist and imperialist slavery."

The Prague, Czechoslovakia, *Rote Fahne*, a German language paper, has given very much space to explaining the character and tasks of the Stakhanov movement. It has published a number of articles from its special correspondent in the U.S.S.R. and articles replying to numerous questions from working women in the textile industry of North Bohemia, etc.

Unfortunately, however, the editorial board of *Rote Fahne* has not effectively repulsed the campaign of slander against the Stakhanov movement and the Soviet Union, just as it has not proved able to give exhaustive replies to the questions raised by workers about the Stakhanov movement.

Meanwhile, our class enemies have very quickly understood the tremendous significance of this movement which is revolutionizing the workers. It is no accident that it is just the German fascist press that has given the signal for a new anti-Soviet campaign. The fascist press was the first to raise a howl around the question of the Stakhanov movement. "The most hated man in the Soviet Union," "the Slave-driver Stakhanov," a "Stakhanovite" working girl beaten up, "Soviet working women defend themselves against exploitation," "plunder of men and machine"—such are the hysterical wails rising from the front pages of *Angriff* and *Voelkischer Beobachter*. The fascists who are dooming the German people to starvation write about "exploitation" of the Russian workers through new methods of work and try to depict the Stakhanov movement as something in the nature of "socialist exploitation", "red slavery", thereby providing a new impetus to anti-Soviet calumny!

Of course, other voices are also to be heard in the bourgeois camp. There are people there also who understand that the Stakhanov movement cannot be defamed with such "arguments". And so they "recognize" the tremendous importance of the Stakhanov movement as a

"specifically Russian" movement, which, however, contains nothing socialist in it, and can only be justified by Russian conditions, by the backwardness of the country and the people who live there.

Czechske Slovo, for example, writes in the issue of Dec. 12, 1935:

"It is a question of methods of education for whipping up the workers. . . . True, these methods can be successful among the Russian people, who fundamentally have remained a lot of big, naive children. . . . It would not be possible to do anything of the kind with the well-read, thinking, Czech worker. It is possible in Russia. . . ."

Finally, there are a number of Socialist newspapers which, although until quite recently anti-Soviet, have now, under the weight of facts and under the influence of the growing sympathy of the Social-Democratic workers towards the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R., been compelled to change their tone on questions concerning the Stakhanov movement.

Sozial-demokraten, Sweden, published a series of articles on the Stakhanov movement, under the title, "A New Type of Man, A New Type of Work".

Robotnizke Noviny, in Slovakia, wrote the following on November 20:

"What is going on today in the Soviet Union is a joyful thing. . . . It is proof of the vitality of socialism, and this is the whole point. It is proof of the fact that the moral level of the workers is rising without any compulsion. . . . For the worker sees that he is increasing the speed at which he is working, not to bring advantage to the capitalists, but to himself, and that the perfecting of production does not bring in its train loss of employment and new enslavement for the workers, but brings an improvement in their position as a whole state. The Stakhanov workers in Russia are proving that socialism is possible and feasible from the purely economic viewpoint as well. . . ."

Besides these more or less "official" utterances of the press, "the voice of the people" can also be heard. Lively discussions are taking place everywhere in the world, among the workers in the factories. The Stakhanov movement has become a subject for daily discussion. During the dinner interval, after work, at home, after radio broadcasts from Moscow, everywhere groups are to be found arguing violently for and against the Stakhanov movement.

In these circumstances, it was very important that the example of the socialism system should be used to show the superiority of the socialist system and to compel all the enemies of socialism to hold their tongues. In this connection we must once more emphasize the fact that the scope of this mighty movement and its historic importance *have not been fully understood*, and that our newspapers in general have not succeeded in showing the toiling masses, *concretely*, by using the example of the Stakhanov movement and the experience of the class struggles of

the proletariat in their own countries, the difference between living conditions under capitalism and under socialism.

In their articles on the Stakhanov movement the majority of our Communist newspapers have not replied to the attacks made by our enemies, have not dissected all the arguments of the enemy, and in some places only adopted an attitude of defense.

How does this arise?

It arises out of the fact that in popularizing the Stakhanov movement as a tremendous triumph for socialism, we have not applied offensive tactics.

It arises out of the fact that sometimes *the editors of these newspapers themselves have not appreciated the tremendous importance and profound revolutionary character of this movement.*

Take, for example, the Prague *Rote Fahne* already mentioned, which has given much space in its pages to the Stakhanov movement. Instead of bringing down arguments in favor of the Stakhanov victory upon the heads of the bourgeois newspaper scribes, *Rote Fahne* has taken a defensive position. And it was no accident that some of the readers of *Rote Fahne* received a wrong impression about the Stakhanov movement, and perplexing questions arose. This was expressed in the letters to the editor. For instance, one miner wrote:

"Workers are thinking that since the employers in all enterprises in Czechoslovakia and in all capitalist countries, as it is, are squeezing out of the workers all that they can, they will now point to the Russian udarniks, whose output leaves that of the Czechoslovakian workers far behind, and easily make it appear that the workers here, in particular miners, are idlers. Moreover, miners here cannot understand how the Stakhanov records are possible at all, since the management of the mines demand the utmost possible output from them and they can only meet the demand by straining their strength to the last drop."

And so, instead of emphasizing, after such a reaction to the Stakhanov movement, the main point in the question, and explaining the difference between labor under socialism and labor under capitalism, putting forward this difference and again and again pointing out that the question is not one that can be compared with capitalist rationalization, *Rote Fahne* writes:

"The Stakhanov movement is indeed rationalization. . . . Yes, the capitalists do the same. . . ."

What is more, the point is left out that under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the center of gravity as regards rationalization measures is not increasing the intensity of labor as in capitalist rationalization. The center of gravity as regards rationalization in the U.S.S.R. lies in bringing order into the productive process, in establishing a division of labor on a wide scale, in squeezing out of technique the maximum that can be squeezed out of it. The Soviet worker, as distinct from the worker in capitalist countries, works seven hours per work-

ing day, with one full day's rest after every five working days; miners work six hours a day; all toilers have an annual holiday of from two to four weeks on full pay; tremendous sums of money are spent on labor protection, etc. The *Rote Fahne* forgets all that.

By way of illustration, *Rote Fahne* published two drawings, showing how the workers labor and sweat under socialism and under capitalism, how they use the same methods of work, the only difference shown being that in one case, under capitalism, the capitalist for whom they work stands over them, and in the other—the Stakhanov worker (presumably signifying that here the worker works for himself), whom the whole of the fascist press had already characterized as a slave-driver, as a man who "whips on" the workers to obtain a greater output. The main question, namely, that of the different nature of labor under socialism and under capitalism (under capitalism, the worker toils for the capitalist and in the U.S.S.R. he works for himself, for his own class), has been passed over here as well.

Rote Fahne has not shown that the Stakhanov workers have surpassed the world records of output because they know *for whom* and *why* they are working. They know that, in place of the forced labor for the exploiters, of working in order to earn a living, as is the case under capitalism, labor is being transformed into joyful, creative work, into work for oneself, for one's own class, and consequently the work goes well, and the workers tire less.

How many convincing examples could be given from the speeches of the Stakhanov workers themselves to show the real importance of the Stakhanov movement, which "is called upon to make a revolution in our industry" (Stalin).

Comrade Sarkisov,* in his speech at the recent plenary session of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., quoted extremely convincing data:

"One of our doctors in the Donbas Anthracite Trust kept a record for two months (October and November) of the sickness among the Stakhanov workers as compared with the non-Stakhanov workers. Here are the results: The number of non-Stakhanov workers given sick-leave from work during these two months was 8.4 for every 100 workers, while among the Stakhanov workers only 1.3. The number of non-Stakhanov workers given leave of absence as a result of injuries was 2.1 out of every 100, while among the Stakhanov workers only 0.4."

(Stalin, interjecting): "What's the reason?"

Sarkisov: "The reason is that the Stakhanov workers have mastered the technique, and there are no injuries and no accidents among them. The Stakhanov worker knows how best to tackle the coal face, how the propping needs to be done, so that the earth will not fall in. And so it is obvious that he earns good wages. He lives far better, is far better off, and as a result sickness among the Stakhanov workers is most insignificant. And yet all kinds of counter-revolutionary elements have said that Stakhanov methods imply so much exertion of muscle and physical strength that they create a dangerous situation as far as safety measures are concerned. As you see, facts point

* Secretary of the Donetsk Regional Committee of the C.P.S.U.

to just the opposite. There is not the slightest doubt that *the way to do away with sickness and injuries among our workers lies through developing the Stakhanov movement in the mines.*"

The Communist press must devote considerably more attention to replying to the "arguments" and calumny of the enemies of the working class and of the Soviet Union, to the effect that the Stakhanov movement signifies a "socialist sweating system", the "physical annihilation of the workers", etc.

Here is what Alexei Stakhanov says of his work:

"It is not a question of physical exertion. I am no more tired now, when I produce over 100 tons, than I was when I was giving only 14 tons. On the contrary, it is considerably easier and simpler to work now. I work, the man behind me does the propping, and the work proceeds smoothly." (*Pravda*, Nov. 12.)

The weaver A. Vinogradova says the following on the same point:

"Allow me, comrades, to say that in spite of the fact that I am 45, I do not feel tired after my work, because I have better food, because I am free from worry as regards my family life, and general conditions which make it possible for me to be healthy and happy." (*Pravda*, Nov. 17.)

And Dusia Vinogradova, the Young Communist, who has taken over 144 looms, instead of 70, said the following in her speech at the conference of the Stakhanov workers:

"There is no fuss and bother in my work, but perfect calm. I am told that there are articles in the capitalist press about us being 'exhausted'. Why, after work I study, and carry on social work; I am a Pioneer leader, and am helping to bring up the new generation." (*Pravda*, Nov. 12.)

Simple answers, which will convince any worker!

We must also show concretely the increase in the wages of the individual worker, the increase in the total wage bill and the increase in the number of workers engaged, so as to smash all the fascist chatter about wage reductions and unemployment.

The Communist press must lend a particularly close ear to the questions and doubts of the workers. It must discover those questions in each individual country which are of particular interest to the workers in connection with the Stakhanov movement, and those of them which arise out of doubts and misunderstandings. And when we reply to the technical questions which interest the workers—such as how it is possible for this or that Stakhanov worker to give such an output—we must never lose sight of the political perspective, explaining how it has become at all possible in general to bring about such achievements, and how they lead to a rise in the well-being of each individual Stakhanov worker, as well as to a rise in the general well-being of all workers, how they are leading to the creation of the new socialist being.

In their press the Communists must raise questions connected with the Stakhanov movement from the viewpoint, the conditions and situation in their own country, and draw a picture of the perspectives of socialism

on the basis of the gigantic victories of the future Stakhanov movement in their own country.

In England, the miners are raising the question of a general increase in wages. All the acute problems of the coal industry are on the order of the day. During the discussion in the House of Commons, prominent Conservatives declared that machinery is to blame for the crisis in the coal industry. In such a situation, we can prove that under socialism, the Stakhanov movement in the Donetz Basin is solving the "coal problem", and also the "problem of the wages" of the miners. How the same machinery, which in the hands of the British capitalist means unemployment, "overproduction", wage reductions, and "depressed areas", means, in the hands of a "non-party Bolshivik" like Stakhanov, a rise in the productivity of labor in the interests of the entire socialist economy, an increase in the well-being of all toilers.

The Stakhanov workers are advanced people educated by the Bolsheviks, and constitute an effective combination of exceptional loyalty to the socialist cause with a profound knowledge of the technical side of production, a creative approach to their own labor. The Stakhanov movement signifies an unheard-of rise in the productivity of labor and a considerable improvement in the material conditions of the workers themselves who take part in the movement.

Almost all the workers at the conference of Stakhanovites reported how wages have increased by leaps and bounds in consequence of the transition to Stakhanov methods of work.

In the U.S.A. they are clearing up the remains of the bankrupt N.R.A. policy. The technocrats persist in their efforts to prove the great happiness which the machine means for mankind, and propose a more just "planned economy" within the framework of capitalism. In these circumstances, the Stakhanov movement provides a fine opportunity for proving that under the capitalist order technique will over and over again inevitably create its own contradictions and engender want and unemployment.

In France, a big discussion is taking place around the question of the future young generation, and about the importance of the human individual. What a fine opportunity to make the Stakhanov movement a starting point and to raise the question of the development of the creative forces of each toiler, the question of the individual under socialism, giving concrete examples of the new, socialist individual in the Soviet Union!

There is not a single question in everyday capitalist life that does not offer new material for raising the question of the Stakhanov movement in the spirit of an offensive.

The following are some such questions:

The question of restrictions upon the further development of technique, of unemployment, of machines, of the destruction of new technical inventions under capitalism, on the one hand, and of the beginning of the new technical revolution, the Stakhanov movement, on the other. The question of the dialectic change in the attitude of the workers towards machines: from the machine-wreckers to the Stakhanovites, to revolutionaries in the sphere of technique.

The question of *the pauperization of the middle sections of society* and the declassing of the unemployed, on the one hand, and the rise in the cultural and technical level of the workers, the beginning of the elimination of the gulf which exists between physical and mental labor, on the other.

The question of the rise in the *well-being* of the working class and masses of collective farmers in the U.S.S.R., in consequence of the growth of the productivity of labor; one of the causes which brought about the Stakhanov movement being that life has improved, that life has become better and more joyous. This is one of the decisive conditions for ever newer and newer victories by the working class on the front of socialist construction, and for the successful movement on the road to its higher phase, communism.

The question of the development of the *small nationalities* under socialism: the attitude of the Ukrainian, the Tadjik, and other workers, collective farmers, Stakhanov workers towards the capital of their socialist fatherland, Moscow, and the attitude of Moscow towards them; the attitude of the Ukrainian peasant, the Ukrainian worker in Western Ukraine towards the capital of the ruling nation—Warsaw, and the attitude of Warsaw towards them.

Point by point we can deal in this way with all the phenomena of the Stakhanov movement, all the chief points in the historic speech of Comrade Stalin, and can find hundreds of points from which to start in order to reveal socialist reality and draw a picture of the prospects of revolution, make our starting point the peculiarities and problems of each individual country. Point by point we can deal with all the problems of capitalist countries with all their national peculiarities, and everywhere find ways of linking up these questions with the Stakhanov movement and the new problems of socialism.

The most important thing is to take the offensive determinedly and confidently, and to popularize all the problems of socialism in a broad and new fashion. In simple language, on the basis of the Stakhanov movement, we can more determinedly, more firmly and more confidently give a fine picture to the broad masses of the growth and development of socialism.

Not for a single minute must we forget that the friends of the Soviet Union comprise a considerably broader circle of people than Communist circles, and that their number can and must be increased considerably. In popularizing the Soviet Union and the Stakhanov movement, as well as when dealing with all the other questions of our mass agitation, we must use a language and a style, we must use arguments, which will make it possible for the Communist press, on the basis of the example of the Soviet Union, to show the broad masses of toilers in an easily accessible and convincing form, what future awaits them under socialism.

The popularization of the Stakhanov movement can and must become the starting point for the winning of thousands of new supporters of socialism and for convincing them of the superiority of the socialist order.

The Webbs' Book on the Soviet Union

By R. PALME DUTT

A SIGNIFICANT landmark of the present stage of thought and discussion, and of the changes developing in the outlook of the Western Socialist movements, is constituted by the appearance of the Webbs' long-awaited volumes.* It is seldom that a book can be said to be a political event; but in the present case there is reason for such a judgment.

We have here the direct confrontation of two poles: on the one side, the reflection of the growing strength and dominance of the new world represented by the Soviet Union and its impact on the ablest and most far-seeing thinkers of the old world; on the other side, a most instructive and interesting final stage of one section of the old school of thought which in the past period has dominated the Western Socialist and labor movement, and which now, in the persons of its foremost representatives, has devoted its attention to a sincere and unprejudiced examination of the new world.

It is not that we have here a Marxist book, or one whose presentation of Soviet institutions and Communist conceptions can be accepted as fully correct. On the contrary, there is much, not only in detail points and particular passages, but in the whole approach and underlying conceptions, with which the consistent Marxist reader will not agree, and much which he will subject to criticism. But it is precisely this outside approach which gives to the book its distinctive value. The importance of this book lies not merely in its contents—though these are of high value—but in the appearance of these contents by these authors. For herein is expressed the historical outcome of a whole chapter of the international labor movement.

It is to the undying honor of its authors that this book has aroused howls of rage from the bourgeoisie and the reactionary official leadership of the labor movement. With a pen dipped in bitterness the London *Times* writes (November 25, 1935):

"Is this the last word of these two great figures in the history of our English thought, in their honored age? If so, it is a sad word. They have said good-bye to the free life of the human spirit, and they beckon us onwards and downwards to the expert and automatic polity of the bee."

The organ of the bourgeoisie understands well enough the doom of their order expressed in this "last word" of these "two great figures", who have had the courage, refusing to let their recognition of facts be colored by their reformist theories, not only to face with undimmed eyes the world's future, but to see and recognize its present growth in

* *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?* by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons. Two volumes, \$7.50.

the midst of conflict and calumny, and even to a certain degree to range themselves upon its side. There could be no more noble epitaph on this crowning stage of work of these two pioneers than this snarl of hatred from the bourgeoisie, replacing the former praise, just as the fulsome eulogies from the same source for a MacDonald are the fitting epitaph on the philosophy that he has consistently preached and practiced to its final humiliating conclusion.

No less indicative, and honorable to the authors, is the ferocious onslaught of the official Labor organ, the *Daily Herald*, through the pen of a Citrine (November 28, 1935):

"There is scarcely a chapter which will not evoke criticism. They, like most visitors who have tried to penetrate the barrage of Soviet propaganda, have been hampered by the absence of familiarity with the Russian language and of that intimate knowledge of the lives of the people which can only be attained by long residence. . . . The Webbs come to the somewhat remarkable conclusion that the Soviet system is not a dictatorship. . . . What the Webbs set out to prove is that the Constitution is democratic. . . . They regard the trade unions as voluntary and independent organizations.

". . . Altogether, there is much material in this book which goes far to justify the methods of Mussolini and Hitler."

Thus, these patiently argued and exhaustively documented conclusions of these most distinguished trained investigators in the English-speaking world are swept aside with a wave of the hand by *this pigmy of official reaction* because the results do not accord with the ready-made prejudices and dogmas of Labor anti-Communist propaganda. Citrine was not even ashamed to repeat the calumnies used by the most unparable fascist scribes about proletarian dictatorship and to throw mud at two of the oldest figures in the English labor movement, by saying that they justify the methods of fascism.

Soviet Communism is the Great Epilogue, which constitutes henceforth the indispensable commentary to the previous works of the Webbs.

In order to estimate the full significance of this work from this point of view, it is necessary briefly to examine the evolution of the Webbs themselves from the time of the *Fabian Essays*, which were published almost half a century before *Soviet Communism*.

As we know, the Webbs were the ideologists of the Fabian Society founded in 1884, which, by its propaganda of "municipal socialism" and petty reforms, which were supposed to transform capitalist society into socialist, led the English workers away from the idea of revolutionary socialism, from the class struggle.

Frederick Engels in his time described the Fabians as people whose fundamental principle was "fear of revolution" (see his letter to Sorge).

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, in his pamphlet, *What Is To Be Done?* refers to the Webbs as being thoroughly scientific (and "thoroughly" opportunist).

Fabianism was the stream which, as regards time, was the harbinger of European Revisionism. A prominent figure and, one might say, the

founder of Revisionism was Bernstein, who, incidentally, spent a number of years in London and sat at the feet of the Webbs. The difference between Fabianism and Revisionism in their attitude toward Marxism was that Revisionism endeavored to "introduce corrections" into Marxism, to deprive it of its revolutionary essence, while Fabianism openly expressed itself against Marxism in general. In the words of its official history, "its first achievement was to break the spell of Marxism in England". (Pease, *History of the Fabian Society*, 1925, p. 236.)

Until 1914 it may be said that Fabianism and the Webbs were still fully confident, even unshakably confident, that they had found the path of progress and that such manifestations of revolutionary and Marxist theories as they came across were in essence obsolete romantic lumber with no application to modern realities. The World War gave them their first shock. In his 1919 Preface to *Fabian Essays*, Webb for the first time tried to leave behind the limited confines of his previous thinking by declaring that "A more general shortcoming was our failure to think internationally. . . . We had none of us given attention either to the continental Socialist movements or to international relations."

In 1923 for the first time the note of doubt of the whole reformist policy appeared:

"For over thirty years our time and energy have been devoted to municipal administration, to research into the facts of social organization, and to devising and advocating measures by which the existing profit-making system may be replaced. . . . We thought, perhaps wrongly, that this characteristic British acquiescence on the part of a limited governing class in the rising claims of those who had found themselves excluded both from enjoyment and control would continue to be extended, willingly or reluctantly, still further from the political into the industrial sphere, and that while progress might be slow, there would at least be no reaction. . . . Worse things than any thought possible ten years ago have happened and are still happening daily."

Yet one hope remained to them, the hope that through a Labor government the way forward might be found to peaceful social change in England. In 1923, Sidney Webb declared in his Chairman's Address to the Labor Party Conference:

"A continuation of the rising curve of Labor vote . . . would produce a clear majority of the total votes cast in Great Britain somewhere about 1926."

Once again reality dealt a hard, but profoundly instructive, answer to these hopes. Nineteen hundred and twenty-six saw, not the dreamed-of Labor majority, but the General Strike, the first clear pointer of the future British revolution. The two Labor governments of 1924 and 1929 were minority governments. Webb took part in both. He was compelled to witness how the Labor government made no advance even to a beginning of social change. On his experience in these two governments, and the conclusions to be drawn, he has maintained a marked silence

in his published writings. A shifting of interest and development to a new stage followed. It was from this point that the Webbs began to develop an increasingly active interest in and close study of the Soviet Union, leading up to the appearance of *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?* in 1935.

It is important to note at the outset that the Webbs approached their subject of "Soviet Communism" as scientific investigators, and not with any predilections in its favor. On the contrary, judging from various references to the questions involved, it can be established that they shared the prevalent views and even misconceptions of the Labor Party and reformist leadership.

What, then, are these conclusions which have thus aroused the anger and hatred of the bourgeoisie and of the reactionary sections of the Labor and trade union leadership? Just these circles have in the past been accustomed to accept without question the unrivaled scientific authority of the Webbs as trained and responsible investigators. Yet today they are up in arms. Here we come to the central achievement of their book and its significance. It is not that their conclusions, taken in their most general character, are new in principle to those already acquainted with the outlook of communism and with the realities of the Soviet order, as these have been developing for nearly two decades. But what is new for the widest public is that these conclusions, these general principles, characteristics, aims and life of Soviet democracy are *here set out and inescapably proved* for the first time, not as subjective impressions of theoretical principles, but on the basis of a full survey of objective facts, with such a wealth of completeness, living detail and illustrative example, meeting and dispelling in the broad sweep of the argument all the thousand-and-one idle skepticisms, criticisms and misconceptions which still commonly block the view, that it is impossible for any impartial reader after a careful reading to fail to be convinced of the truth of this living picture of a new and higher form of democracy in being.

This investigation is the more effective for its purpose because it is presented throughout from the basis of the outlook of the "enlightened general public" of the existing Western world, knows its audience, knows their difficulties, prejudices and habits of thought, and is able again and again with extreme sureness of touch to give explanations that are needed or to clear away legends and misconceptions. It is thus not simply a great scientific work (although in its analysis of the constitution it has also this character), but above all a great work of "popularization", although the authors did not set themselves this aim.

What have they seen? First and most important of all, they have seen the *mass character* of the new social order; they have seen the masses in motion, shaping their own lives in a way that has never happened before in history, as the key and center of the new proletarian regime on its way to the classless society. This is the biggest thing of all; and yet it is what many even sympathetic liberal observers, still more the hostile ones, most often miss. These commonly see what they call the great "socialist experiment"; they see a picture of the devoted

"Communist rulers" heroically remaking the country and bringing new life and culture to the masses; and they bring back reports as of a benevolent socialism from above which they either praise with delight or alternatively fear that the "loss of liberty" is too great a price for these admitted material and cultural benefits. But the reality they do not see.

Here the scientific training of the Webbs in observing comparatively the *actual working* of social institutions has stood them in good stead. They could not fail to see the significance of such a fact for municipal administration as that "apart from such salaried staff as exists, as many as 50,000 citizens are at any moment participating in the municipal administration of Moscow, and nearly as many in that of Leningrad" (p. 58); that 70,000 village councils are enjoying an "unprecedented freedom, without such safeguards as prior enquiry and sanction, a statutory maximum for local expenditure and a limit to local taxation" (p. 31); "every public department is in fact genuinely eager to stir all the 70,000 village Soviets into the utmost public activity" (p. 30); that, again apart from salaried staff, three million trade union members are at any time actively engaged in the 186,640 factory committees and shop committees and their sub-committees, so that "apart from the officers, paid and unpaid, at least 15 per cent of the trade union members are actively engaged in committee work" (p. 177); that of the gigantic electorate of 91,000,000, no less than 85 per cent take direct part, not merely in the sense of casting a vote, but directly participating in meetings and discussions lasting over many hours and sometimes over successive days.

Similarly for their understanding of the key role of the trade unions. After disposing of the Citrine-*Daily Herald* legend that the trade unions are not voluntary organizations by the simple and conclusive demonstration that as recently as September, 1934, the Secretary of the All-Union Central Committee of Trade Unions "complained that 22 per cent of all those employed for wages or salary in the U.S.S.R. were outside the trade unions," they proceed to show the new role of the trade unions in relation to production, the control of industry and all the conditions of life of their members when there is no longer a profit-making class in possession and the state is the workers' own state. They conclude in a passage of exceptional interest from the authors of the classic, *History of Trade Unionism*:

"It seems to us clear that, in the great industrial establishments that have for half a century been characteristic of Russian industry, the 18,000,000 of trade unionists, whilst not actually entrusted with the management of their several industries, do control to a very large extent, in their constant consultation with the management and with all the organs of government, the conditions of their employment—their hours of labor, the exercise of factory discipline, the safety and amenity of their places of work, and the sharing among themselves of the proportion of the product that they agree should be allocated to personal wages. In like manner the trade unions

not only control, but actually manage by their own committees, the disposition of that other part of the product which they agree should be allocated to the whole range of social insurances, education, medical attendance, holidays, and organized recreation of all kinds. . . . The influence upon every organ of government of the 18,000,000 trade unionists is immeasurably great." (Page 302.)

The similar examination through the whole range of the agricultural collectives, the cooperatives, the Party and the youth organizations, etc., leads to the picture of a society marked by "the personal participation in public affairs of an unprecedented proportion of the entire adult population" (p. 450).

This understanding determines the greatest achievement of their whole book, that *they have demonstrated on a gigantic canvas the reality of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a new and higher form of democracy.* This is the achievement which has above all aroused the wrath of all their bourgeois and Labor critics. They directly throw down the challenge to the old abstract shibboleth, which constitutes the alpha and omega of official Labor wisdom on the question of Communism, the cant formula of "dictatorship versus democracy". "Can we wisely limit our enquiries," they ask, "by such alternatives as 'aristocracy, oligarchy and democracy' or 'dictatorship versus democracy'?" (*Ibid.*) Their conclusions are the more remarkable since they frankly confess that they do not understand in principle what is meant by "the dictatorship of the proletariat"; they ask, if it means "no more than the rule of an immense majority over a minority, why should it be termed a dictatorship?" (The answer may be suggested that it is precisely the ruthless dictatorship against the exploiting minority, robbing them of their power customary in bourgeois democracy to nullify the abstract democratic forms, which makes possible the real democracy of the masses; and in consequence we have a real self-rule of the masses; under the leadership of the working class and its Party, in contrast to the abstract deceitful "majority rule" of bourgeois democracy or of the still more patent plebiscitary humbugs of fascism.)

But while the theory remains uncleared, they see with firm grasp the realities. With painstaking care they discuss and dismiss the allegations of autocracy, dictatorship by a party: "the term dictatorship is surely a misnomer for this untiring corporate inspiration, evocation and formulation of a General Will among so huge a population" (p. 430). In the same way they answer the question of dictatorship by an individual or group of individuals: the government of the U.S.S.R. is "the very opposite of a dictatorship" (p. 436).

"Our own conclusion is that, if by autocracy or dictatorship is meant government without prior discussion and debate, either by public opinion or in *private session*, the government of the U.S.S.R. is in that sense actually less of an autocracy or a dictatorship than many a parliamentary cabinet" (p. 449).

The definition is thus reached of the true constitution of the U.S.S.R. as being that of a common social aim (a "creedocracy") inspiring

"... a multiform democracy in which Soviets and trade unions, cooperative societies and voluntary associations provide for the personal participation in public affairs of an unprecedented proportion of the entire adult population."

Or again:

"In short, the U.S.S.R. is a government instrumented by all their adult inhabitants, organized in a varied array of collectives, having their several distinct functions, and among them carrying on with a strangely new 'political economy' nearly the whole wealth production of the country" (p. 450).

If we compare this with the old-fashioned definition of democracy as "government of the people, by the people, for the people", it is impossible to fail to be struck by how completely this new description of the U.S.S.R. by the Webbs exactly expresses the realization of this for the first time in history, not as a phrase, but as a reality.

For the contrast between the rights of the toilers in capitalist countries and in the Soviet Union leads the Webbs to a most powerful exposure of bourgeois "freedom". Against the myths about the supposed "freedom of choice" of the consumer in the capitalist world, they answer with the crushing weight of facts:

"It takes a little reflection for even a trained economist to realize that the vast majority of the commodities displayed in the public markets or in the shops of the London streets are *as effectively forbidden to two-thirds of all the inhabitants of England as if this large majority were statutorily prohibited from purchasing them*" (p. 692).

As for "freedom of opinion", their treatment of the realities in Britain is incisive:

"Let us take, to begin with, the position of the schools and the teachers. So far as concerns nine-tenths of the children of school age, in Great Britain, their parents have no freedom of choice as to schools or teacher or curriculum. The teachers are equally obliged to adopt as the basis of their instructions of their pupils, and even of their intimate conversations with them, the fundamental conceptions of the national civilization, such as constitutional monarchy, parliamentary democracy, British imperialism, the capitalist organization of industry, and a conventional Christianity. In no part of the country could a teacher in a public elementary school kept his (or her) job, however sincere and fervent his belief, if he was known to inculcate atheism, communism, the abolition of parliament, republicanism or the dissolution of the British Empire" (p. 1029).

Or again:

"It is habitually forgotten how numerous and extensive are the classes to whom, in Great Britain among other countries, freedom of expression of opinions displeasing to the government, or to the majority of the citizens, is denied, either formally by

regulation, or informally by the danger of losing their means of livelihood" (p. 1030).

On the basis of their examination of the facts they reach the inescapable conclusion that it is not the question of "freedom", but the question of *which class rules*, that determines the difference between the capitalist world and the Soviet world:

"For the individual citizen the propaganda is as inescapable in the one case as the other. In all countries his mind is bludgeoned to compel him to admit a whole series of ideas. *Where systems differ is in who wields the bludgeon and with what purpose*" (p. 1032).

At the same time the development of the U.S.S.R. is laying the indispensable material basis for the maximum "individual freedoms";

"Assuming that the increase in wealth production and in population continue at their present compound rates, it seems likely that in the course of two or three decades the U.S.S.R. will have become the wealthiest country in the world, and at the same time the community enjoying the greatest aggregate of individual freedoms" (p. 1037).

Their anger and contempt are especially vehement against the illusions of freedom of the "wealthy intellectuals" in the Western world. In a magnificent footnote they castigate the lucubrations of H. G. Wells on the Soviet Union as "only one more instance of the incurable blindness of the wealthy intellectual" (p. 1037). Their passage on "The Western Freedom of the Rich" deserves to be especially emphasized:

"It is amazing how blind we can be to the living conditions to which the vast majority of our fellow citizens are subjected, if we are ourselves in other circumstances. If he is not trammeled by wearing a crown or by membership of the court circle, and not enmeshed in the obligations of a landed estate or active participation in business, the intellectual well-to-do citizen of London or New York can surround himself exclusively with books of his own choice; can subscribe only to the newspaper which he dislikes least; can amuse himself expensively without going to the cinema that he despises; can attend the church that he finds congenial or none at all if he so prefers; can travel in the countries that are to his taste, or 'follow the sun' so as to live always in the climate that suits his bodily comfort. Very naturally he becomes as little conscious of the circumambient mental environment that coerces his less fortunate fellow citizens as he is of the weight of the atmosphere—to the influence of which even he is at all times irresistibly subjected. Of course he is not by any means as free as he thinks he is."

This brings us to the central question—the question of *revolution*. The Webbs state:

"We may safely conclude, from the common experience of mankind, that whenever in any country there takes place a great

redistribution of power among groups or classes, a new destination will be given to existing wealth, especially that in the form of ownership of the means of production. If that new destination is forcibly resisted by the old possessors, there has always been fighting; and both during and after the fighting more or less 'terrorism' by those who prove to be the stronger and who regard this as the only means of destroying or maintaining the social revolution that is occurring. This fighting and 'terrorism' and the misery to which it leads are, as it seems to the present writers, strong reasons in favor of proceeding as far as possible by general goodwill" (p. 600).

"As far as possible"—but the possibility is no longer very confidently indicated.

They further conclude that the decisive question on the issue of revolution is not the abstract question of violence, or the supposed avoidance of suffering through leaving the old regime in possession, but the value of the new social order that is created:

"Further generations will estimate the worthwhileness of national conquests or internal revolutions, not so much by the temporary misery that they inevitably create, but largely according to the relative social value, in each case, of the new order in comparison with the old. In the U.S.S.R. the substantial completion of the liquidation of the landlord and capitalist, together with the coincident abandonment by the western powers of their original project of armed intervention to suppress Soviet Communism, have not only made humanity to individuals at least socially safe, but have also witnessed a considerable building-up of new social tissue, and the purposeful reorganization of community life on a deliberate plan for the Remaking of Man" (p. 601).

This is already a very important modification of the old anti-revolutionary outlook of the Webbs.

* * *

It is a factor making for strength of this account as a whole of the Soviet order that one of the twelve chapters is devoted thus specifically to "The Liquidation of the Landlord and the Capitalist" as the indispensable basis of the whole construction and positive realization of the new life. And it is interesting to note that just this lesson has struck most powerfully an acute Liberal reader, Sir Ernest Simon, the foremost housing expert in Britain, who writes with enthusiasm of the new light opening out before him from a reading of the Webbs' book (*New Statesman and Nation*, December 14, 1935), saying, "I believe this to be the most important book on political and economic matters which I have ever read", and declares with reference to his own experience:

"The most important aspect for us in England is undoubtedly the new economic and industrial system. We talk a great deal about planning in this country; but our planning is a constant

fight against vested interests. Town planning and housing would be relatively easy if we could act on the advice of our best experts. In fact, the satisfactory rehousing of the people is thwarted at every turn by the dreary and unending fight against people whose personal interests would be damaged if we did the right thing. All this friction is abolished in Russia."

Yes: "all this friction is abolished in Russia"—because the landlord and capitalist is liquidated and the kulaks also have been liquidated as a class. In other words, the central problem today in the capitalist countries is not technical and administrative; it is the problem of power, of the conquest of power.

It would be asking too much of the Webbs to expect that, while the historical significance of the revolution once accomplished is fully recognized, there should be the same clearness of understanding of the path leading to the success of the revolution, of the struggle for power, through which alone the subsequent constructive achievement was made possible. Their interest is rather in the fruits of the revolution than in the revolutionary struggle, in the positive work of construction rather than how the construction was made possible. To ask more than this would be to demand, not merely observation of existing facts, but that they adopt the Marxist platform. On such questions the absence of Marxist theory is inevitably felt. Hence, the noticeable weakness in the short sketch of the history of the revolution (in Chapter VII, and other passages), of the role of the Party before and in the revolution, of the character of the March revolution, of the attitude of Lenin to the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions, to the slogans of the Constituent Assembly and Soviet Power, etc., all of which fall markedly below the level of the rest of the book.

In particular, the relation of the Party to the class is not clearly seen. The Communist Party today in the Soviet Union is described with the warmest appreciation and admiration of its key role in the whole structure; but it is described as a "companionship", an "order", "a Vocation of Leadership" comparable to Wells' utopian theory of an "Order of the Samurai", a kind of classless elite leading the proletariat:

"In Lenin's view the socialist revolution could be carried into effect only by the long continued efforts of a relatively small highly disciplined and absolutely united party of professional revolutionists acting persistently on the minds of what he called the proletariat" (p. 442).

"It is interesting to recall that essentially such a Vocation of Leadership, termed the Order of the Samurai was suggested by Mr. H. G. Wells in 1905, in his book entitled *A Modern Utopia*" (p. 1131).

The real character of the Party is not grasped as the foremost revolutionary section of the working class, the union of the most clear-headed fighters of the working class, bound by a hundred ties to their fellow workers, an organization which is integrally part of the working class, and therefore alone able to lead and fulfil its social role. This

misconception necessarily leads to a weakness in seeing the driving forces of the revolution.

Hence also necessarily follows the collapse of understanding in relation to the Communist International, which is regarded as a disastrous error in conflict with the essential purpose of the Soviet Union and a contradiction to the peace policy of the Soviet Union. Here, a fuller study of the writings of Lenin and of Stalin might have brought a closer understanding of this question. But this failure to understand necessarily follows from the abstract disparity in the attitude of the Webbs towards the work of construction which is going on today and towards the necessary work of breaking down the old system, which has already been done. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is seen with close sympathy and admiration, because it is engaged today on the work of construction. The other Communist Parties are seen with a condescending and depreciatory eye, not only because they are smaller, but above all because they are engaged in the task of "mere rebellion". So follows the suggestion that it would be better to form an International of "Socialist or Communist statesmen and municipal administrators", i.e., an "International" of Stalin and Vandervelde, of Molotov and Morrison, as statesmen, but excluding Thaelmann and Dimitroff, since it is "not practicable to combine for political purposes the representatives of governments with those of agitational groups, many of them 'illegal'" (p. 1117). This is the perfect logical result of a complete absence of any class basis of outlook. The Webbs in no way regard this new "International" as a political organization. In their opinion, it will be simply a scientific organization, investigating questions as to how better to arrange social life, without the need for adopting any compulsory decisions.

We must not complain of these lacunae of understanding in spheres outside the main scope of the book. The Webbs frankly confess at the end that, while they feel the victory of world communism to be inevitable, they do not see clearly how it is going to be achieved:

"At this point we hear an interested reader asking 'Will it spread?' Will this new civilization, with its abandonment of the incentive of profit-making, its extinction of unemployment, its planned production for community consumption, and the consequent liquidation of the landlord and the capitalist spread to other countries? Our own reply is: 'Yes, it will.' But how, when, where, with what modifications, and whether through violent revolution or by peaceful penetration, or even by conscious imitation, are questions we cannot answer" (p. 1143).

With these words the book ends. It is for others to answer in practice the questions which the authors leave unanswered. Marxism teaches and the history of the U.S.S.R. confirms that in practice this "new civilization" can only be realized through the action of the working class along the path of the revolutionary class struggle, in other words, through the path of the Communist International. We have the same confidence in the correctness of that answer for the rest of

the world as the Russian Bolsheviks had before their great October revolution, to which confidence incidentally the Webbs attribute no small part of their victory (p. 947).

"The eyes of millions of workers, peasants, small towns-people, office workers and intellectuals, of colonial peoples and oppressed nationalities are turned towards Moscow, the great capital of the first but not the *last* state of the international proletariat." (G. Dimitroff, *The United Front Against Fascism and War*, p. 125.)

History has given the first tremendous demonstration of the correctness of our Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics; it will give the next through the further development of the world revolution. But we must always remember that we can only finally prove the correctness of our viewpoint in the battle; and we must not be surprised when some who do not share our outlook today will only join us *after* we have won the victory.

On the  INTERNATIONAL List

WHEN JAPAN GOES TO WAR

By O. TANIN and E. YOHAN

"These two brilliant Soviet authors have produced a new work which takes its place beside *Militarism and Fascism in Japan* as the indispensable key to contemporary events in the Far East." —T. A. Bisson, *Book Union Bulletin*

\$1.75

RULERS OF AMERICA

By ANNA ROCHESTER

Hailed by Colston E. Warne, Professor of Economics, Amherst College, as "the most penetrating analysis of the composition of the financial groups that rule America that has yet appeared." A Book Union Selection.

\$2.50

MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTION

By JOSEPH STALIN

The bases of Soviet nationality policy expounded by its most brilliant interpreter.

\$1.50

Ready at the end of March

THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES

By JAMES S. ALLEN

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF MARXISM - LENINISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 514 E. Market St.
Akron: 365 South Main St.
Baltimore: 501A North Eutaw St.
Boston: 216 Broadway
Buffalo: 65 West Chippewa
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.
Camden: 304 Federal Street
Chicago: 161 North Franklin St.
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.
200 West Van Buren
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.
Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.
Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.
Duluth: 114 West First St.
Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.
Hartford: 88 Church St.
Hollywood: 1116 No. Lillian Way
Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.
230 S. Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Ave.
Madison, Wisc.: 312 W. Gorham
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 241 Marquette Ave.
Newark: 847 Broad St., 3rd fl.
New Haven: 280 Park St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
112 West 44th St.
140 Second Ave.
115 W. 135th St., Harlem
1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx
1337 Wilkins Ave., Bronx
2050 Wallace Ave., Bronx

369 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn
4531 16th Ave., Brooklyn
4417 Queens Boulevard,
Sunnyside, L. I.
Omaha: 311 Karbach Block
Oakland: 419 12th St.
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 104 South 9th St.
118 W. Allegheny Ave.
4023 Girard Ave.
2404 Ridge Ave.
Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.
Portland: 314 S. W. Madison St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St.,
Room 42
Reading: 224 North Ninth
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.
San Diego: 635 E St.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
121 Haight St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Seattle: 713½ Pine St
4217 University Way
Spokane: West 9 Riverside
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D.C.: 513 F St., NW
Youngstown:
310 W. Federal St., 3d fl.

*Write for a complete catalog to
any of the above addresses or to*

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City